DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 773 JC 710 197

TITLE	Faculty Development in the Junior College. A Second Interim Report on the Program With Developing Institutions, 1969-70.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C. Program with Developing Institutions.
PUB DATE	Aug 70
NOTE	87p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Conferences, *Consultants, Faculty Evaluation, *Instructional Improvement, *Junior Colleges, *Teacher Improvement, Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	American Association of Junior Colleges, Program With Developing Institutions

ABSTRACT

The second year (1969-70) of the Program with Developing Institutions (PWDI) emphasized working with faculty members rather than with administrators (as in the first year) in the areas of faculty development and instructional improvement. Fifty-three junior colleges participated in this program, financed under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and sponsored by AAJC and USOE. The project was composed of: (1) Vincennes National Conference, which reviewed and set the tone for the whole project; (2) regional workshops and activities; (3) consultants sent to participating colleges to help assess their strengths, weaknesses, and potential; (4) specialized workshops as a response to needs for group consultation in federal affairs, computer use, and human affairs; and (5) "Salt" seminars, which focused on the systems approach to learning. The keynote of the program was decentralization, with some of the functions formerly performed by the central office placed in the hands of regional coordinators and the funded colleges. An important feature of this second-year project was the provision for colleges to encourage faculty personnel to make inter-campus visits and attend professional meetings on program funds. The results of evaluations of the second year of this continuing project by the participating colleges are included. The reader might want to consult the First Interim Report of PWDI (ED 032 070). (CA)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED052773

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

A Second Interim Report
on
The Program With Developing Institutions
For the Year 1969-70

PWDI

A Joint Venture
of the
American Association of Junior Colleges
and
The United States Office of Education
and
Fifty-Three Junior Colleges

JC 710 197

AAJC Program With Developing Institutions
One Dupont Circle, N.W. #410
Washington, D.C. 20036

Publication #10
August 1970

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

AUG 30 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

INTRODUCTION

The Program With Developing Institutions, developed by the American Association of Junior Colleges in cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education's Division of College Support, completed a second year of operation on June 30, 1970. It was a year of emphasis on faculty development and improvement of instruction, with some of the functions formerly performed by the central office in Washington placed in the hands of the regional coordinators and the funded colleges. The central office was in the position of a service agency, offering assistance to the colleges on consultants, organizing or assisting with workshops, and providing communication among the colleges through general publications and special memoranda when needed.

This new orientation constituted a major change from the more centralized "crash program" of the first year. The initial program on "Planning for Development" was described in Developing Institutions: The Junior College, the first interim report of the Program With Developing Institutions, published in July, 1969. The second year of the program was devoted entirely to a faculty development project, funded for forty of the colleges in the original project and thirteen others deemed by USOE to be ready for the faculty and instructional development phase of the program. In both content and administration it differed greatly from the first-year program; the emphasis was now on working primarily with faculty members rather than with administrators.

This monograph is a second interim report, on the second year of the continuing Program With Developing Institutions. As before, a great deal of evaluation by the colleges and their representatives was built into the second-year program, and the results are included in this report. The feedback from this constant evaluation process was fully utilized in planning modifications in the program.

It should be emphasized that although the American Association of Junior Colleges administered the program, it was and is financed entirely by funds from grants to colleges under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, administered by the Division of College Support, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

I wish to thank members of the program staff for their help in assembling data on the program and preparing this manuscript for publication---especially Brent Smith, Lee Ann Focer and Helen Minifie.

Selden Menefee
Program Director

Washington, D.C.
August 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction iii
Table of Contents v

I. Background of the 1969-70 Program 1

II. Keynote: Decentralization 4

III. The Vincennes National Conference 7

IV. The Consulting Process 9
Evaluation of the Consulting Process 11

V. The "SALT" Seminars 13

VI. The Regional Workshops and Activities 18

VII. Specialized Workshops 28
Federal Affairs Workshops 28
Computer Workshop 29
Human Relations Workshop 29
The AAJC National Convention 30

VIII. Faculty Travel 31

IX. Publications 35
The Newsletter 35
Monographs 39

X. Associate Colleges 40

XI. General Evaluation of the Program 41
College Comments on Significant Experiences . . . 43

XII. Design for the Future 57

Appendix A: The 1969-70 Program Proposal 61

Appendix B: A Listing of 1969-70 Funded and Associate Colleges 71

Appendix C: A Listing of Chief Consultants to Member Colleges 83

Appendix D: Final Evaluation of 1969-70 Program (tabular form) 87

Appendix E: Expenditures of PWDI Funds in the 1969-70 Program 89

I.

BACKGROUND OF THE 1969-70 PROGRAM

In September, 1968, before the first year of the AAJC Program With Developing Institutions[1] was half over, it was necessary for the staff and advisors of the program to consider whether to recommend continuation of the project, and if so, what shape it should take. The staff felt that some of the 85 colleges in the first-year program would and should "graduate" into independent consortia, and that those which remained could go on from general planning to faculty development as part of a second-year project. A second group of colleges, not associated with the AAJC/PWDI before, could enter a first-year project on Planning for Development. U.S. Office of Education officials at the working level appeared to be in agreement that such a two-track program would be practical.

An advisory meeting was held in Washington on September 21, 1968, and was attended by the twelve regional coordinators and several members of the PWDI National Advisory Committee. Dr. David W. Smith of the U.S. Office of Education and members of the AAJC staff were also on hand. After intensive discussion, consensus was reached on several points:

(1) The first-year PWDI program had already been of great value to the colleges involved in it and should certainly be continued for those colleges needing it.

(2) The content of the program for the continuing colleges should be broadened and emphasis placed on faculty development and instructional improvement.

(3) A new group of colleges should be brought into the program for a replication of the Planning for Development project then in effect. This was considered essential in view of the fact that about 50 colleges become eligible for aid each year under Title III of the Higher Education Act, by virtue of becoming five years old.

(4) The second-year program of faculty development should be decentralized to allow the colleges and regional coordinators greater scope in selecting and employing consultants and in other programming. Faculty committees on Title III programs should be encouraged to aid in the planning on each campus.

(5) Colleges in both groups should have some money set aside to use as they wish, to meet unanticipated needs consistent with

---

1 See Developing Institutions: The Junior College (an interim report published in monograph form by PWDI, July, 1969) for a report of the first year's Program With Developing Institutions.

the purposes of the project; $1500 per college was thought to be a fair amount for what Dr. Fred Giles, the advisory member from Washington State, called "the 'yes' fund," to enable the administrators to say "yes" to reasonable requests from faculty and staff for travel funds or equipment related to faculty development--requests that could not otherwise be met for budgetary reasons.

(6) A national conference should be held--preferably on a centrally located junior college campus. Advisor Isaac Beckes, president of Vincennes University, Indiana, offered his campus, including dormitories, for a meeting in June.

(7) Every effort should be made to involve university and four-year college education teachers as resources for faculty and instructional development in the 1969-70 program. This could be done by bringing them into the program as consultants, particularly at national and regional conferences.

(8) A smaller number of regional coordinators--perhaps eight to ten instead of twelve--was agreed on. Existing regional coordinators agreed to coordinate the submission of regional consortium applications before the November 15 deadline.

All of these suggestions were accepted and included in a consolidated proposal sent out to interested and supposedly eligible junior colleges by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., executive director of the American Association of Junior Colleges.[2] The response was impressive. By the November 15 deadline, some 165 colleges, 149 in 36 states and 16 in Puerto Rico, applied for inclusion in the Program With Developing Institutions. Some 108 applications were for the faculty development project and 87 were for the planning project. (Some applied for both in the hope that at least one application would be acceptable; this accounts for the apparent discrepancy in numbers.)

The number applying would undoubtedly have been even larger but for the fact that several groups of member colleges, with the assistance of AAJC in most cases, had formed independent consortia and applied for their own grants under Title III instead of applying for continued assistance as part of the AAJC/PWDI regional consortia. Such independent groups were formed and were funded in Kentucky, the Western Carolinas, Oklahoma, South Texas, Washington State, California and Puerto Rico. Other colleges, such as Allegany and Charles County Community Colleges in Maryland, applied for and received sizeable individual Title III grants (bilateral with a four-year assisting institution). Many of these grants resulted from applications building on the experience of the first year's planning project in the AAJC Program With Developing Institutions. Some of the colleges submitted new bilateral or group applications and also applied for a second year

2 See Appendix A for the text of the consolidated proposal.

of the Program With Developing Institutions in faculty development, as a sort of "insurance" of some Title III assistance. If they received larger grants for their own projects, the smaller "extensive" aid from the AAJC/PWDI was usually disallowed by the U.S. Office of Education (except for the South Texas Consortium, which overlapped with PWDI).

While the applications were being considered, USOE officials made clear their intention of continuing the program but on a basis no larger than the first year--about ten percent of the total of $6.9 million available for junior colleges under Title III of the Higher Education Act. The decision in the Division of College Support, USOE, was to confine the second-year project to a single track--faculty development--in which 40 of the colleges in the 1968-69 program would be refunded for a second year, and 13 new ones added--colleges thought to be ready for the faculty development phase of the program. A fairly high amount of funding per college was retained as requested in the application--a gross amount of $12,746 per college as compared to about $7,000 per college awarded under PWDI the previous year.

The distribution of colleges funded necessitated a revision of the regions contemplated earlier. Since there were no junior colleges in the western third of the country which were eligible for funding and could not be taken care of through independent regional consortia or bilateral grants, the number of regions was cut back from twelve the first year to eight in 1969-70, following in general the regional borders of the previous year. (Kentucky and Puerto Rico had become independent consortia.)

In Appendix B is a complete listing of the 53 colleges funded for the 1969-70 period of operation.

As before, the program was organized and funded through a group of coordinating institutions who were themselves among the 53 funded colleges. Thus, Federal grants were made to eight colleges only; they were fiscal agents for groups of colleges ranging in number from four to nine. The coordinator at each of the eight colleges submitted a regional budget, received the funds in installments, paid the American Association of Junior Colleges a flat amount per college in advance for its services during the year, and paid or reimbursed the member colleges for PWDI activities (consultants, expenses of faculty members in attending workshops, etc.) during the year. Funds allocated for colleges had to be spent or committed by June 30, 1970.

II.

K E Y N O T E : D E C E N T R A L I Z A T I O N

The 1969-70 Faculty Development Project of the PWDI was decentralized to a great extent as noted above, in line with the recommendations of the regional coordinators and advisors and the U.S. Office of Education.

The regions were given additional responsibility in setting up a more comprehensive series of workshops, in paying consultants, and in supervising the use of funds. (In 1968-69, about 80% of the funds were handled by the AAJC central office, and only 20% by the regional coordinators; in the 1969-70 project, more than 80% of the money was handled by regional coordinators, so the funding relationship was reversed.)

Decentralization went beyond this, however, to the funded colleges themselves. Each college received $1500 in unbudgeted funds to do with as it wished, to meet unforeseen needs in the field of faculty development. In some of the regions (notably the Northwest and Southwest Regions) this amount was sent in cash to the colleges at the beginning of the year; in others the money stayed in the regional fund, to be drawn upon by the colleges.

The college presidents or coordinators also had complete control over the selection of consultants for their respective campuses; only about half of the consultants used were from the classified directory of consultants supplied by the AAJC central office. In fact, since many of the consultants were selected independently by the colleges and reimbursed by the regional coordinator, the central office staff sometimes did not know who the working consultants had been until the colleges returned their evaluation forms at year's end. (As a result of this rather unsatisfactory situation, the feedback and evaluation procedures on the consulting process were tightened up for the following year.)

The rationale for the decentralization was as follows:

(1) The colleges had, in most cases, been in the program for a year, and were therefore experienced and capable of taking more initiative in matters involving the program.

(2) Since the program was not conceived as a permanent institution with a continuing membership, but rather as a seed program to help colleges get started on the road to constructive change, it was considered desirable for members of the colleges' staff to take over more and more control of their Title III activities. In many colleges, such as Norwalk Community College, Connecticut, a faculty

committee was set up to pass on all expenditures; in others, academic deans or division chairmen served as campus coordinators in charge of the Title III program (or programs, since some colleges in PWDI also had other projects funded under Title III).

(3) Since AAJC was in the position of an agency contracting its services to the eight regional coordinators, it was felt that the central office should take less responsibility in coordinating the programs nationally if the regional colleges could and would take over some of this responsibility at a local level--which they indicated they were willing to do. In short, the first-year program had been a crash program, designed to help a large number of colleges get off dead center, and had to operate with more central direction; but by the end of the year, a large number of consultants and other resources had been marshalled in support of the program, the experience of the first year was known to most of the colleges, and there was less reason for centralized coordination.

On the whole, decentralization worked reasonably well, though there were some disadvantages:

(1) Communication between colleges and the central office was impaired somewhat, particularly on the consulting process, as noted above. The tendency was for communication to become too much of a one-way affair, from central office to regional coordinators and colleges, with too little feedback.

(2) In some cases the consultants experienced undue delays and difficulties in being reimbursed, particularly when coordinating college officials had to observe state rules on mileage and living costs in issuing checks.

(3) The central office had to reduce the initiative it had taken in the first year, as in employing consultants for conferences and workshops, because the budget for this was given to the regions. The decentralization of funds even made it necessary for the regions to send money to AAJC so that the national conference (and four bi-regional seminars) could be organized effectively and the consultants for these conferences paid. For other specialized workshops organized on a national level, it was necessary to charge registration fees to those attending because of the lack of a national budget to cover costs.

These difficulties were relatively minor, however, and were offset in the eyes of the participating colleges by the advantages of decentralization--the ability to run their own programs to a great extent, thus meeting local needs; and the greater motivation to take initiative that comes through local control. On balance, it was felt by most of those concerned that decentralization had worked reasonably well, and should be continued to the extent that it had proven successful, particularly with colleges which had had the experience of a year in the planning program.

Identical questions, on evaluation forms used for both years, showed no statistically significant difference in the ratings given by college officials to the over-all program and AAJC's part in it:

General Program Evaluation Compared With First Year Figures

Complete figures for the year-end evaluation of the 1969-70 PWDI Faculty Development Program by 53 funded colleges appear in Chapter 11 and are presented in tabular form in Appendix D.

A comparison of both the overall evaluation of program success and the value of AAJC participation in the program between this year's decentralized program and last year's more structured program can be given at this point:

Over-all Evaluation of Program By Colleges

Rating	1968-69 (85 colleges)	1969-70 (53 colleges)
Very valuable	70%	68%
Considerable value	25%	30%
Some value	5%	2%
Little value	-	-
No value	-	-

Question: Do you think this year's AAJC/PWDI program would have been equally valuable to your college if AAJC had not participated in it?

Response	1968-69	1969-70
Yes	-	2%
No	94%	89%
Don't know	6%	9%

III.

THE VINCENNES NATIONAL CONFERENCE

The second national conference of the Program With Developing Institutions was held on the campus of Vincennes University, Indiana's only public junior college, June 15-18, 1969. The conference, with the theme "Strategy for Change in the Junior College," succeeded in setting the tone for the year's faculty development project. It also provided the opportunity, as the Airlie Conference had done the previous year, for college personnel and consultants to come together, benefitting from an exchange of ideas while being exposed to the presentations of nationally-known speakers.

The national conference was again held at the very end of the school year to allow for maximum participation. The Vincennes location proved useful as this innovative campus provided a model of the creative implementation of many ideas advocated at the conference. The Vincennes University staff organized the conference well. Confusion that could have resulted from travel arrangements at three different airports with varying time zones was largely avoided as the college provided transportation. Conference attendees were housed in Vincennes University dormitories. The hospitality extended further to guided tours of the college facilities, many of them ingeniously reconverted commercial buildings, and the presentation by the Vincennes University Players of a musical, "Star Spangled Girl." Informal entertainment in the dormitory added to the participants' enjoyment.

More than 250 college representatives and consultants attended the conference. All but two of the 53 member colleges were represented; in addition, representatives from 14 associate colleges (one of them from Calgary, Alberta) were in attendance. In keeping with the thrust of the new program, a large percentage of conference participants were faculty members. One college, Coffeyville Community Junior College, sent 12 representatives, the majority of whom were faculty members. Each of the designated "chief consultants" of the member colleges was invited to attend, with an opportunity provided for these consultants and their respective colleges to confer and make arrangements for the coming year. Large-scale faculty representation permitted the setting up of discussion groups by subject matter areas. In addition, college representatives met by regions to coordinate their plans for regional meetings and to discuss mutual benefits that could be derived from the sharing of consultants and through inter-campus visits.

As the conference theme suggests, the presentations were geared toward inspiring constructive innovation on the junior college scene with a special emphasis on improvement of instruction. The conference was structured to allow discussion periods with an exchange between speaker and audience following each address, and a further breakdown into smaller discussion groups to consider the major concepts set forth.

The conference keynoter, Gabriel Ofiesh of the Catholic University of America, stressed the commitment junior colleges should have to individualized instruction, challenging participants to make full use of new educational media to improve instructional techniques. William A. McClelland of the Human Resources Research Office, George Washington University, dealt with "The Process of Effecting Change." Innovative techniques were touched upon by B. Lamar Johnson of UCLA's School of Higher Education and Albert Canfield, Washington State Community College Board Director. A USOE session outlined federal programs of support for the junior college. Panel discussions were held on these specific topics: "The Change Process and Faculty Innovation," "The Catalysts of Change," "How Do You Turn a Student On?" and "Education for Whom?"

Rated most valuable by participants in the conference was the dinner address by Glenn Gooder, President of Los Angeles City College, entitled "Let's Start Over." In noting the changed times that have precipitated a crisis on the college campus, Dr. Gooder concentrated on the dimensions of change and challenged college personnel to begin to "navigate with clear vision." The text of his speech is included in the published proceedings of the Vincennes National Conference, published as No. 8 in the PWDI monograph series under the title, "Strategy for Change in the Junior College."[3]

Of 131 conference participants responding, 87% gave the conference either the "very valuable" or "considerable value" rating on the five-point scale. In the year-end evaluation, 31% of the colleges responding gave the national conference a "very valuable" rating; 49% of the colleges judged the conference to have been of "considerable value," 18% gave a rating of "some value" and one college deemed the Vincennes meet to have been of "little value." Individual comments on the conference were generally quite favorable except for the prevalent view that it was too tightly scheduled. Those who attended the Airlie Conference and this one generally agreed that this one had been more useful, both because it was held on an actual junior college campus and also because it was more sharply focused in setting the tone for the year to follow.

---

3 "Strategy for Change in the Junior College," American Association of Junior Colleges, Program With Developing Institutions, Publication No. 8, September, 1969.

IV.

THE CONSULTING PROCESS

The use of consultants continued to be a basic part of the Program With Developing Institutions in its second year of operation, though in a less structured way than in the program's first year, when teams of three consultants visited and revisited nearly all of the funded colleges. The colleges had always had the right of refusal in considering consultants, and requests for particular consultants were usually approved by the central office; but in that first year, the great majority of the consultants recommended by the AAJC office--either for team or for individual visits--were agreed to by the college presidents. As the year went on, many colleges asked for consultants with specialized abilities, and if these were not available, they were found and recruited to the PWDI panel of consultants.

During the first 15 months of the program (the first year was extended, from April 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969) a panel of over 300 consultants was amassed, nearly all with junior college experience --either successful practitioners in the two-year college field itself or specialists in the universities who had worked with junior or community colleges and knew their needs. All of these were highly recommended by leaders in the junior college field, and often by colleges which had used their consultative services successfully The names were classified by areas of specialization in a Directory of Consultants and Advisors, which was first published in August, 1969, and sent out to all PWDI member and associate colleges and to the consultants as well. The directory was in demand all year; it underwent continuous revision and expansion until by May, 1970, when a second edition was published, nearly 500 names were included. Both editions contained an introductory statement that AAJC and the Program With Developing Institutions did not endorse those listed, but merely noted their availability. In addition, one-page vita forms were sent to all consultants so that photocopies could later be made to be sent to the colleges requesting detailed background information. (Those failing to return vitae were eliminated from the panel. Also those indicating they required higher pay than the $100 per day honorarium permitted by USOE were eliminated from the list.)

With consultant resources built up in this way and with many highly-recommended individuals in every area and region known to be available for brief consulting trips, it was thought feasible for the colleges to make their own selection of consultants in the second year of the program. The Washington PWDI office's role, aside from

publishing the directory and offering information on consultants to all who requested it (both funded and associate colleges), took several forms:

(1) A recommendation that each of the 53 funded colleges select a "principle consultant" (preferably with general expertise plus specific ability in some field of particular interest to the college) from a place not too far away so that he (or she) could return to the college from time to time if needed. One or more persons were suggested and the college made its own decision. Over 90 percent of the colleges went along with this approach, and most of the principal consultants chosen were invited to attend the national conference at Vincennes University in June with expenses and a flat $100 honorarium paid. See (3) below.

(2) During the year, the central office constantly studied and analyzed college needs and actively sought additional qualified consultants, especially in such areas as the systems approach, multi-media, individualized and developmental methods of instruction. Ultimately these were incorporated into the revised directory of consultants.

(3) The PWDI also arranged for the assignment of consultants to special college workshops in some cases, and to national and biregional workshops. The use of PWDI consultants as central figures in on-campus faculty workshops is exemplified by the following cases:

(a) A successful workshop conducted by Dr. Johnnie Ruth Clarke of St. Petersburg Junior College on the campus of Morristown College, Morristown, Tennessee, was described in a letter:

"Dr. Clarke visited Morristown College and conducted a two-day workshop with the entire faculty on October 3 and 4, 1969.

During the workshop period, a considerable amount of time was spent defining and discussing the behavior characteristics of students; especially those of the type enrolled at Morristown College. Having identified the student and the problem, the faculty proceeded to establish the needs of the student in the light of the offering Morristown College could supply. An introspective view of the curricular offerings was undertaken, and suggestions made relating to a revision of the curriculum in order that the student needs could be met.

The faculty, under the direction of Dr. Clarke, devised workable solutions to the problems presented and made obvious strides in overcoming the dormancy which had existed in proposing change.

The entire workshop was a howling success and the faculty came alive to a degree heretofore unseen. With the enthusiasm expressed, and the continued interest which is obvious, we hope to continue along this line and draft some proposals of change for the Board of Trustees which will assist in the future direction of Morristown College."

(b) A faculty workshop at North Greenville Junior College, Tigerville, South Carolina:

"On December 5 and 6 (1969), the North Greenville faculty held an on-campus workshop dealing with the individualization of instruction using programmed materials and other media. We had the services of Dr. Morris Norfleet of Moorehead State University. We also were fortunate enough to have the presence of Mr. Jack Neas, the coordinator for the Western Carolinas Junior College Consortium (another Title III involvement of North Greenville). Twenty-four faculty members participated in the meetings and there was considerable practical help found for using the hardware that we have to improve and individualize instruction."

Taking the consulting process as a whole, there was no significant difference between the ratings given consultants in the first and second year's programs, as shown by the tables below:

Evaluation of the Consulting Process

Funded colleges were queried in the final evaluation questionnaire as to the value of consultants' visits. The comparative figures of the 1969-70 Faculty Development Program with the figures from last year's program appear in the table below:

Evaluation of Consultants' Visits

Rating	1968-69 (85 colleges)	1969-70 (53 colleges)
Very valuable	47%	51%
Considerable value	44%	41%
Some value	9%	6%
Little value	-	2%
No value	-	-

The figures reveal a marked similarity in the rating of consultants in the two years of the program's operation. The number receiving the top two ratings on the five-point scale is almost identical this year to the first year's rating.

The consultants were also rated individually as to their value to the college. The comparison of the two years of the program, presented in the table below, show that consultants this year were individually rated somewhat lower than the preceding year.

Evaluation of Individual Consultants

Rating	1968-69 (256 consultants)	1969-70 (226 consultants)
Very valuable	54%	53%
Considerable value	36%	29%
Some value	9%	13%
Little value	1%	4%
No value	-	1%

Of the 226 consultants listed by the colleges as having consulted in the 1969-70 program, only 104 had been recommended to the colleges by the PWDI central office; 122 of the consultants selected by the colleges were not on the PWDI consulting panel. (Many of these who received the highest rating were subsequently invited to join the consulting panel so that their expertise could be shared with other colleges in the future.) The following table illustrates the somewhat higher rating given those consultants recommended by PWDI:

1969-70 Faculty Development Program
Evaluation of Individual Consultants

Rating	"PWDI Consultants" (104)	Other Consultants (122)
Very valuable	57%	50%
Considerable value	29%	29%
Some value	8%	17%
Little value	5%	4%
No value	1%	-

V.

THE "SALT"* SEMINARS

The 1969-70 Program With Developing Institutions from the outset became involved with the "systems approach" to education, involving clear, detailed behavioral objectives, multi-media avenues to learning, individualized instruction, careful assessment of results, reevaluation and revision of the learning process. Much of the interest in the systems approach was inspired by Benjamin Bloom's "Learning for Mastery," which concluded that 90 to 95% of all students can master the essentials of any given subject, given enough time and alternate paths to mastery.

The idea of the new individualized approach to the learning process was widely advocated, and accepted by many administrators and faculty members in member colleges, by Fall of 1969. A common reaction among faculty members at that time was, "You don't have to sell us any more on the systems idea. What we need now are workshops on how to do it--how to write behavioral objectives and all that." With funds left over from the Vincennes Conference, PWDI undertook to meet this need.

Sterling Institute, an educational research and training organization with offices in Washington, New York and Boston, was approached as a possible agency to organize four information seminars on "Education and Learning Techniques." The stated purpose of these meetings, as given by the associate director of PWDI to Sterling Institute at the outset, was:

> The purpose of these meetings is to hold in sections of the country (for the geographical convenience of the college groups) activities for the continuance of the work of the opening national conference by engaging in intensive examination and information seeking seminars on a very important aspect of the problem. The performers and the materials they use are to constitute a task force, mobile and used repeatedly from place to place.
>
> The program is presently focusing on the need for information by the colleges on the advances and changes in effective learning processes. We are preparing the staging of special information seminars on the educational and learning techniques. Some of the subject areas to be treated are (1) the systems approach to curriculum and course design, (2) course behavioral objectives, and (3) the selection/use of learning materials from a full range of media.

---

* Systems and Advanced Learning Technologies

Sterling Institute then offered its services to PWDI as a private organization "dedicated to the discovery and application of new knowledge to increase organizational effectiveness." It offered, for $5,000 and a registration fee of $50 per person (in four sessions limited to about 75 persons each) to organize four seminars or workshops on "New Learning Technologies," supply workbooks, and deliver a "package" of usable audio-visual and other materials developed and improved during the seminars to PWDI for continued use after the initial seminars were over.

Specifically, the prospectus submitted by Sterling Institute to the PWDI Advisory Committee and Regional Coordinaors in mid-December stated:

> This is in response to the American Association of Junior Colleges request for the development of four bi-regional information seminars with workshop session on "New Learning Technologies" in the teaching/learning process. The schedule (by PWDI regions) will include:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | I and II (East Coast) | Sterling Institute, Washington, D. C. January 15-17 (1970) |
> | III and IV (South) | NASA Center, Huntsville, Alabama January 22-24 |
> | V and VI (Midwest) | Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana January 29-31 |
> | VII and VIII (Southwest) | Oklahoma Military Academy, Claremore, Oklahoma, February 5-7 |
>
> The total approach will be designed to optimize learning in a changing educational environment. The program will focus on the need for information by the colleges on advances and changes in effective learning processes.
>
> <u>Goals and Objectives</u>
> The primary goals and objectives are:
> - -to identify the characteristics of technology;
> - -to recognize and identify the characteristics of modern learning theory as applied through the behavioral sciences;
> - -to define behavioral course objectives;
> - -to use technology as a means of continuing learning--applying the selection/use of learning materials from a full range of media;
> - -to evaluate and identify those educational activities which provide for optimum learning;
> - -to recognize and identify the "interrelatedness" of activities and events;
> - -the application of the above--and the recognition of changes necessary to make the curriculum responsive to the changing requirements of a technological society... particularly to the disadvantaged students in the junior and community colleges.

The media and method of presentation for course subject matter are selected on the basis of what is to be learned. The relationship between what is to be learned, how it is to be taught, and how the student learns it is explored, defined in behavioral objectives, and analyzed in the nature of the learning experience. Specific objectives of the workshops will be established to identify the most appropriate strategy for achieving the stated objective.

Since this was in line with the objectives of the PWDI Faculty Development Project, and Sterling Institute appeared to be equipped to organize the seminars (based on work it had done on individualized learning at the U. S. Naval Academy and elsewhere), the Sterling proposal was presented to a meeting of the PWDI regional coordinators in December, 1969. After they approved the proposal, an agreement was reached with the Institute to organize four seminar-workshops. Each seminar was to begin on a Thursday evening and end on a Saturday afternoon. Existing audio-visual materials, plus some especially developed by the University of Maryland's Educational Technology Center under the direction of Dr. Donald G. Perrin, were used in organizing the seminars.

At the outset, Sterling renamed the seminars, originally billed as on "New Learning Technologies," with the acronym "SALT," standing for "Systems and Advanced Learning Techniques."

The PWDI staff provided feedback after each seminar in the form of the participants' evaluation and comments classified and tallied; this was hand delivered to Sterling Institute by Monday afternoon each week. Some basic behavioral objectives were suggested to Sterling Institute by the PWDI director after the second seminar, to try to get improvements in the format and content in the remaining two. These objectives, if implemented, would have enabled the participants to do the following:

1. Define the systems approach to education, and give its implications in terms of:
   (a) Defining the general purpose, and setting the limits, of a course or unit of instruction, at the junior college level;
   (b) Writing specific (behavioral) objectives for such a course or unit;
   (c) Selecting instructional strategies for such a course or unit, including appropriate media;
   (d) Providing varied opportunities for individualized learning;
   (e) Varying the time schedule for learning;
   (f) Evaluating the learning achieved by the individual student at the end; and
   (g) Revising the learning strategy in the light of the evaluation.

2. Given a course or unit and its general purposes and limits, write a clear, specific behavioral objective meeting these three criteria in a simple statement:
   (a) What the student must be able to do at the end of the unit of study;
   (b) The conditions under which this learning must be demonstrated; and
   (c) The degree of proficiency which must be demonstrated to show that successful learning has taken place.
3. Given a specific junior college course or unit or instruction, with stated objectives, select an appropriate learning strategy other than the traditional lecture-discussion method, for use in a specified part of the course; and list one or more media to be used to implement it.

Despite the feedback process, the "SALT" Seminars remained virtually unchanged from week to week during the four-week period. The evaluation of the seminars by the participants indicated that they tended to be rated lower each week and none of the seminars was rated as high as the national and multiregional workshops put on by PWDI itself during the preceding year, as the following table shows:

STERLING INSTITUTE SEMINARS: SUMMARY OF EVALUATION BY PARTICIPANTS

	(1) Very Val.	(2) Consid. Value	(3) Some Value	(4) Little Value	(5) No Value	Returns
No. 1 Sterling Institute Seminar Washington, D.C. Jan. 15-17	26%	49%	18%	7%	0%	61
No. 2 Sterling Institute Seminar Huntsville, Ala. Jan. 22-24	24%	35%	27%	14%	0%	78
No. 3 Sterling Institute Seminar Lafayette, Ind. Jan. 29-31	15%	44%	38%	2%	1%	72
No. 4 Sterling Institute Seminar Claremore, Okla. Feb. 5-7	10%	37%	43%	10%	0%	68
TOTALS:	19%	40%	32%	9%	0%	279
Comparative percentages on past specialized workshops were as follows:						
1968 Private College Workshops	78%	22%	0%	0%	0%	68
1969 Occupational Ed. Workshops	37%	53%	(other, 10%)			119
1969 Community and Public Relations Workshops	45%	45%	9%	1%	0%	83
1969 Vincennes National Conference	38%	49%	12%	1%	0%	135

The most prevalent suggestions made by the participants for future seminars of this type were the following, all mentioned by ten or more persons in one or more of the seminars:

- -Shorten sessions and/or lengthen number of days of conference to reduce fatigue and to absorb and discuss the large amount of information.
- -Give participants materials ahead of time to guide them in their achievement of objectives.
- -Organization and planning needs improvement for more effective use of time and media
- -Be more specific and give more direction in group discussions.
- -Show results of new technologies by using school representatives who are in the process of using multi-media systems of instruction.
- -Much more emphasis on specific applications of audio-tutorial methods to subject areas.
- -More informal exchange of ideas.
- -More relevant presentations, i. e., role playing had little value as presented.
- -Set the seminar itself in terms of behavioral objectives.
- -More instructions and more relevance for small groups.

VI.

THE REGIONAL WORKSHOPS AND ACTIVITIES

Regional workshops were held in late summer to kick off the Faculty Development Project for 1969-70. Faculty personnel were involved in all cases, and some of the colleges brought their entire faculty to the regional meetings.

Most of the eight FWDI regions were active throughout the year in setting up other workshops and organizing other activities. The decentralized nature of the 1969-70 Program, with much of the thrust of decision-making placed at the regional level, had left organization of regional activities largely with the regional coordinators.

Perhaps the outstanding example of a regional workshop was the Carolinas - Region II Fall workshop held September 19-21 at Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, with 237 participants and over 80 percent of all faculty members in the region's six funded colleges attending.

Both the Middle South Region and the Plains Region put out regional newsletters. A conference on computers, originally planned on a regional basis for the Southeast Region, was expanded to include other interested FWDI colleges. A series of workshops were held throughout the year in the Southwest, Middle South and Plains Regions as faculty development was undertaken through group effort at the regional level.

A brief account of regional activities within each of the eight regions follows:

Region I - North Atlantic States

A regional planning meeting was held at Norwalk Community College on April 28, 1969. As the diverse nature of the region (four colleges in three states and three different state systems) made activity on a regional basis somewhat difficult, it was decided to schedule some workshop meetings on a split basis, with the two colleges in Maryland and the two in New England.

Accordingly, no workshops were held on a region-wide basis. At a meeting in Bel Air, Maryland, December 18, 1969, representatives of Catonsville and Harford Junior Colleges decided to exchange information and pool their efforts in inter-campus meetings designed to promote community services and developmental education activities. This arrangement was, however, never fully implemented. Cape Cod Community College in Massachusetts hosted a faculty workshop to investigate

solutions to teaching problems in the two-year college, May 1-2, 1970, with invitations sent to Norwalk Community College (the other FWDI college in New England), the two FWDI colleges in Maryland, and forty other two-year colleges in New England.

Benefits of the program in this region were mainly on an individual college basis, then, and are detailed in Chapter XI of this report.

Region II - The Carolinas

At a preliminary planning meeting April 17, 1969, at Peace College in Raleigh, North Carolina, the six member institutions met to discuss the program budget. A second planning session held at Peace College on May 9-10, selected a regional planning committee and discussed regional participation in the National Conference at Vincennes. John Roueche of the Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia led a discussion at this session on faculty development.

The regional planning committee met on May 22 to plan workshops on faculty development at a regional level. $18,000 had been allocated for this purpose. Accordingly, a regional workshop was planned for September 19-21 at Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, to include all faculty members, members of the administrations and representatives from the governing boards of member institutions.

The Region II Fall Workshop at Myrtle Beach set a new record for attendance and faculty participation at regional meetings. Altogether 237 persons were in attendance with over 80% of faculty members from the six funded institutions. Four associate colleges sent representatives. The keynote address was given by Kenneth Skaggs of the Occupational Education Project of AAJC and individual clinics were held by John Roueche and Barton Herrscher on the systems approach to instruction, by Mayrelee Newman on the use of media, Melvene Hardee on student involvement, Eileen Kuhns on individualizing of instruction and David Smith on preparation of Title III proposals. There were two workshop meetings in each of a dozen subject matter areas, from business to social science, and a viewing of the film, "The Now Colleges." Of 119 individuals returning evaluation forms, 26% rated the workshop as having been "very valuable;" 41% judged it to have been of "considerable value;" 29% gave a "some value" rating with only 4% rating it lower on the five-point scale.

A conference of 27 student representatives from the Region II colleges was held at Mount Olive College, February 13-14, 1970, on the topic, "The Rights, Freedom, and Responsibilities of Students in Relationship to the Learning Environment of the Campus." The conclusion reached by the students was that the whole educational process, including instruction, should be oriented toward meeting the needs of students.

The Region II colleges were among 44 colleges represented at a Federal Affairs Workshop held May 14-15, 1970, at Mount Olive College.

I believe the regional workshops at Myrtle Beach and Mount Olive were among the most valuable parts of the program for 1969-70.
-W. Burkette Raper, Regional Coordinator

Region III - Southeast

At a planning session held April 18, 1969, 42 representatives of the eight Region III colleges set July 25-26 as the date and Rock Eagle, Georgia, as the place for the regional workshop. The 1969-70 budget was reviewed and accepted.

The Rock Eagle Workshop attracted 54 representatives, predominantly faculty personnel from member colleges. Sessions focused on resources for the development of the faculty on campus, the faculty member in his community, the faculty in the classroom and the faculty member in his profession. Fourteen consultants participated in the program.

A Fall Faculty Workshop planned by a forum committee appointed in May 1969, with advice continuously of a lead consultant funded by Title III, was conducted on the campus of each of the eight member colleges. Improved instruction through further faculty development was a continuing theme for each workshop.

A long-range program planning workshop was held in 1969 on the ABAC campus with regional colleges sending representatives.

Representatives of Region III colleges met at Doraville, Georgia, near Atlanta, on October 10, 1969, to discuss plans for the formulation of new applications for federal grants with Richard Steele and David Smith on hand as consultants.

Several sectional meetings on PWDI planning were held at the annual meeting of the Georgia Association of Junior Colleges, October 18, 1969, at Middle Georgia College. All member colleges sent representatives.

The Computer Workshop (described elsewhere in this interim report) was hosted by Region III and was held at Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College on April 7, 1970, with Gil Saunders of the AAJC Occupational Project in charge.

Consortium member colleges sent representatives to the Sterling Institute Seminar at the NASA Center, Huntsville, Alabama, in April 1970, where much was said about behavioral objectives.

In addition to the above items, many faculty members of participating colleges have been permitted to visit other junior college campuses and observe innovations and procedures that would be of benefit to students on their respective campuses. Many of our teachers are in disciplines where there is only one instructor. To be able to visit with colleagues on other campuses has been of tremendous benefit to them. One faculty member had this to say about the program of inter-visitation: "The interaction with others while on Title III trips was inspiring. It gave me an opportunity to get ideas from other instructors as well as those of the consultants. Visitation was also of great benefit and I think that more of it will be necessary." One can accurately state that our colleges are moving into the mainstream of academic and community life.

The Title III Cooperative Program has been the "frosting on the cake" which enabled the eight member institutions to climb on top of programs otherwise already planned and do something big from a new vantage point which would not have been possible otherwise.

An attempt has here been made to report the sense of happenings as captured by those of us having the responsibility of leadership. This was our most successful year, but it appears that an even better one is well under way now. Nothing succeeds like success, and that principle has certainly functioned with member colleges in this faculty development project.

-Loyal V. Norman, Regional Coordinator

Region IV - Middle South

The Faculty Development Project was inaugurated with a regional meeting in April 1969, with E. B. Moore of Auburn University as a visiting consultant. Plans were made for a regional workshop in Jackson, Mississippi, August 15-16.

The Middle South Region's Jackson workshop was attended by 128 people, over 80 percent of them teachers. Nine member colleges and five associate colleges attended from three states. Copiah-Lincoln College, Wesson, Mississippi, topped the list with 30 in attendance. College presidents of the member colleges met in a session of the Jackson conference to lay plans for a November workshop on improvement of classroom instruction and also discussed the desirability of each college informing other colleges of the visits of special consultants so that observers might be sent.

Small discussion groups were conducted at Jackson by each of the following consultants: E. B. Moore of Auburn University on "What is My Responsibility to the Student?", Noel McInnis of Kendall College on "What is My Responsibility for Learning and Methods of Instruction?", Ann Ackourey of Miami-Dade Junior College on "What is My Responsibility for Defining, Specifying and Writing Instructional Objectives?" and Eileen Kuhns, Mt. Vernon Junior College, on "What is My Responsibility for Evaluating the Effectiveness of Junior College Instruction?" David Smith represented USOE and conferred with presidents and deans on their Title III proposals.

91% of Jackson attendees responding with an evaluation form rated the conference as either "very valuable" or of "considerable value."

The Region IV Fall Conference with the theme "Teaching--The Touchstone?" was held at Cumberland College, Lebanon, Tennessee, November 2-3, 1969. 161 participants from twenty colleges and universities in ten states were in attendance. Subject area breakdowns were again made and clinics were held with able consultants in the following areas: instructional media; personalizing instruction; writing objectives; students in academic affairs; and Title III proposals. Keynoter was Kenneth G. Skaggs of the AAJC Occupational Project with an address on "The Junior College Today." Roger H. Garrison of Westbrook Junior College, Portland, Maine, addressed the conference on "New Approaches to Teaching." Oral and written evaluations received by the regional coordinator indicated that the conferees considered the workshop vital and rewarding.

Region IV was active in supporting attendance by member colleges at the PWDI-sponsored "SALT" Seminar and some Region IV member colleges were represented at the one-day Computer Conference in Georgia and the Human Relations Workshop in South Carolina.

The region also published a regional newsletter which assisted in publicizing the regional workshops and other regional activities.

In talking with teachers and administrators, and in reading their evaluations of Region IV workshops and programs related to the Faculty Development Project, I believe that we share an increasing awareness of what makes teaching effective and also deeper concern for the human potential in every student. Our basic concern has been to help each student master those skills and subjects that are essential to his development as a person who can make a valuable contribution to society.

The Title III Program under the aupices of the USOE and the AAJC has helped each college in Region IV look realistically at its educational objectives, examine carefully new approaches, and exchange ideas and programs that broaden our vision and challenge our thinking.

Individually, the colleges in Region IV have been holding on-campus workshops, sending teachers to institutes, and sharing inter-campus visitations. Many of our teachers are now actively engaged in writing instructional objectives, enriching course content and evaluating their success in motivating and teaching their students.

-Ernest L. Stockton, Regional Coordinator

Region V - Midwest

The 1969-70 PWDI National Conference, covered in detail in Chapter III of this interim report, was held on the campus of the Region V coordinating institution, Vincennes University.

A regional meeting was held in Chicago on October 18, 1969, for the purpose of planning for the 1970-71 year and also to discuss regional cooperative projects in instructional evaluation and remedial reading. Representatives from five member colleges and five associate colleges were in attendance and met in three group sessions to discuss the three outlined areas of discussion. Shafeek Nader, PWDI Associate Director, discussed "What the Developing Colleges Program is Trying to Do." A proposal for participation in the 1970-71 Foreign Curriculum Consultant Program on a cooperative basis was outlined. Member institutions presented a summary of PWDI activities to date on their campuses.

Region V colleges participated in the "Salt" Seminar held at Purdue University and at various educational conferences publicized through PWDI communications.

A regional planning meeting at Chicago's O'Hare Airport on April 4, 1970, discussed budget revision, utilization of remaining monies, suggestions for group cooperative workshops and utilization of the series of eleven films on "The American Community College" which the region purchased from Chicago T.V. College.

-Isaac K. Beckes, Regional Coordinator

Region VI - Northwest

The Title III funds were used in Region VI in a variety of ways, all of which had some value. The major activities were regional and special conferences, consultants to campuses and faculty visits to other colleges. A summary of the activities for 1969-70 follows:

Regional Conference - Templar Park, Spirit Lake, Iowa, August 17-20, 1969. There were 74 junior and community college staff members from ten colleges in attendance. (Editor's note: Glenn Gooder, President, Los Angeles City College, the conference keynoter, presented the "strategy for mastery" approach to learning. Other consultants present included President Robert Lahti of William Rainey Harper College, who held workshop sessions on faculty orientation and in-service training and on meeting the needs of students; Dr. Fred Teague, director of the Kansas State University Instructional Media Center, who discussed and demonstrated the use of new media for instruction; and Dr. William Banaghan of the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, who discussed the junior college philosophy as seen by different segments of the staff. Of those returning evaluation forms, 33% rated the conference as "very valuable," 46% as of "considerable value," 19% as of "some value," with only 2% (one return) lower on the five-point scale.)

Bi-Regional Conference (SALT Seminar) - Purdue University, January 29-31, 1970. Thirty-two faculty and administrators from this region attended, representing eight colleges.

University of Iowa Cooperative - A rather ambitious program to improve instructional procedures in the two-year colleges in the region, and at the same time provide for better articulation with the University of Iowa in six subject matter fields was undertaken, starting with a planning meeting on October 22, 1969.

Coordinators were appointed in each of the subject matter fields--one from a junior or community college and the other from the University of Iowa. In most of the areas, seminars or workshops for from 2-5 days duration were planned for later in the year. The four Title III colleges of Iowa pooled some of their funds to provide finances for consultants and other expenses. All two-year colleges in the region were to be invited to participate.

Much planning was done, but only four meetings were held, and only a small amount of the funds were used. A request has been made to carry over the unused funds and it is hoped that all of the sections will become active this fall.

Other Activities - Three colleges of the region combined in the purchase of two films of the Chicago TV College series and shared the films throughout the year.

The concentration in this region was on the visitation of faculty members to other colleges and attendance at specialized workshops in addition to the various regional conferences indicated above. Consultants were brought to the campuses in limited numbers this year compared to the first year of the program.

As regional coordinator, I met with the colleges in the Instructional Development Program on May 6 in Iowa City to plan cooperative and regional activities for the 1970-71 school year, and met with other colleges in the Developing Institutions Program on May 9th in Minneapolis for the same purpose.

My personal evaluation of the program is that it has proved very profitable to the participating colleges. I base my opinions on conversations with staff members of our colleges. We feel very fortunate to be able to have the various experiences made possible by the Title III funds. As a regional coordinator, I have tried to make as many of the benefits as possible available to other colleges in the region even though they were not funded.

My own reaction to the various activities made possible by Title III funds is consistent with other ratings and evaluations in this and in the other regions--that is, that the most valuable experiences, after the consultants have helped identify areas of need, is in visiting other colleges by faculty and other staff members.

Regional and national conferences and consultants to the campus are needed also, but it is my opinion that a large portion of the funds should be used for faculty travel to and visitation of successful college operations.

-James F. Loper, Regional Coordinator

Region VII - Plains

The 1969-70 AAJC/PWDI project began with a national conference at Vincennes University, Vincennes, Indiana. All colleges in Region VII were represented at the national conference. There were a total of 37 individual participants from Region VII at the conference.

Following the June national conference at Vincennes, in July, Region VII held its own regional conference at Otero Junior College, La Junta, Colorado. Once again, all seven colleges in our region participated in this conference. Over 80 individuals attended the regional conference. Such matters as teaching techniques, use of audio-tutorial devices, teacher self-evaluation, the development of behavioral objectives, and the improvement of instruction were subjects for this conference.

All colleges in Region VII held pre-college workshops in late August and early September, 1969. A typical example was the five-day workshop held at Dodge City Community College, August 24-28. Four consultants were used at this workshop as participants explored ways to improve the instructional program and worked on the development of behavioral objectives.

All member colleges in Region VII had personnel who attended various conferences sponsored by AAJC/PWDI. This included the conferences at Purdue University on audio-tutorial techniques, the workshops on human relations, and the public and community relations workshops. In addition, instructors of member colleges visited other colleges in the area.

Many of the colleges in Region VII conducted special faculty development workshops between semesters. An example of this kind was the special institute conducted at Dodge City Community College on January 26-27, 1970.

An important conference involving Region VII and Region VIII was held at Oklahoma Military Academy, Claremore, Oklahoma, on February 5-7, 1970. Once again, all member colleges in Region VII were represented at this conference. Some 80 individuals from our region attended the Claremore conference. The Sterling Institute produced a good program dealing with an analysis of teaching systems and techniques which would be employed in a systems approach to instruction.

On April 16-18, 1970, another Region VII conference was held on the campus of Dodge City Community College. All schools represented in Region VII were in attendance at this workshop as well as three consultants and the PWDI Program Director.

In summary it can be said with considerable confidence that the Program for Faculty Development funded under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and organized through the AAJC/PWDI project was an outstanding success in our region in 1969-70. The national conference, two regional conferences, special conferences on systems analysis, individual visits to other campuses, individual college workshops and institutes, special individual trips to institutes and workshops sponsored by PWDI, and other professional activities all demonstrate the great interest for the 1969-70 Program developed among the member and associate colleges in our region. -Charles M. Barnes, Regional Coordinator

Region VII also published a regional newsletter.

Region VIII - Southwest

College representatives met in April 1969 to discuss the program budget and plans for the coming year. It was decided to plan a series of workshops on a regional level for administrators and also for faculty personnel. The cooperation of the University of Texas and Sam Houston College in assisting with these workshops was secured.

The Region VIII Fall Leadership Conference was held in Houston on September 29-30, 1969, with representatives from member institutions in attendance. Richard I. Evans, Robert B. Howsam, and June Hyer, all of the University of Houston, and David W. Smith of Longview Community College, Missouri, addressed sessions on the conference theme of "Motivation for Innovation." John Orcutt represented USOE and Shaf Nader the PWDI central office in further sessions. All conference attendees returning evaluation forms rated the conference either "very valuable" or of "considerable value" on the five-point scale.

The second workshop of the year for the Texas and Oklahoma colleges was held November 20-22 in Austin. The program attracted 120 people, mainly faculty members, from the region's seven funded colleges and from five associate colleges. Texas Southmost College had the largest group present--35 faculty members who came in a chartered bus from Brownsville. Conference addresses included "Improving Professional Performance," by James Reynolds, junior college specialist at the University of Texas; "Improving Faculty Effectiveness" by Russell Cooper of the University of South Florida; "Responding to Student Needs" by Joseph W. Fordyce, Santa Fe College, Florida, and "Effective Administrative Performance" by Kenneth Freeman, Texas Technological University and a former president of AAJC. In addition, a number of laboratory sessions were held on a number of specialized topics of relevance to faculty personnel.

A spring workshop was sponsored biregionally at Oklahoma Military Academy at Claremore, Oklahoma, February 5-7. Each member institution sent six representatives to the conference at which Sterling Institute presented a packaged program on "Learning Systems."

A final leadership conference was held on April 29, 1970 at Kilgore Junior College in Kilgore, Texas. The program for the past year was reviewed and plans for the future year were discussed.

The emphasis for the region was that of individual development. The principal strength developed in the program was that of growth in sophistication and initiative. We anticipate 1970-71 will be an outstanding year as a result.

-Richard Strahan, Regional Coordinator

VII.

SPECIALIZED WORKSHOPS

In the second year of the program's operation, the central office again attempted to respond to needs expressed for group consultation through the organization and sponsorship of specialized workshops. These were developed with the cooperation of other AAJC offices and projects, as in the case of the Federal Affairs and Computer Workshops, or independently, as in the case of the Human Relations Workshop.

Federal Affairs Workshops

In collaboration with the AAJC Governmental and Urban Affairs Office, the PWDI central office assisted in the scheduling of regional Federal Affairs Workshops designed to aid institutions in proposal writing and successful techniques to be used in application for federal funds. These workshops followed a National Federal Affairs Workshop held in Washington, D.C. in October, 1969, at which 24 member and 113 associate colleges of the PWDI were in attendance. The Washington meeting featured HEW Secretary Robert Finch, Commissioner of Education James Allen and Senator Harrison Williams, Jr., author of the current Comprehensive Community College bill before Congress.

Successful workshops were held on a local basis in Tacoma, Chicago, Boulder, Kansas City, Birmingham, Gainesville and Mount Olive College in North Carolina. Greatest participation by PWDI member and associate colleges came at Gainesville and Mount Olive, where workshops were arranged at the request of the central office to serve colleges in the program. Workshops typically involved a proposal-writing session with representatives from USOE's Division of College Support, as well as the dispensing of general information on federal programs open to junior college participation. Representatives from the Departments of Labor and Housing and Urban Development. the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Small Business Administration were also present. Each workshop lasted two days, with an additional half-day available for consultation with federal representatives if needed.

The Gainesville and Mount Olive workshops received generally high ratings from those participants submitting evaluation forms. At the latter workshop 44 colleges were represented, with some 60 persons in attendance; and in the evaluation process, 86% of those responding rated the Gainesville workshop as either "very valuable" or of "considerable value." (There were too few returns from Mount Olive to yield significant results.)

Computer Workshop

A series of workshops on "The Computer and the Junior College" were conducted during the year by the AAJC Occupational Education Project funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. One-day workshops were held during the year in Illinois, Texas, Washington State, Pennsylvania, New York State and North Carolina with personnel from PWDI member and associate colleges among those in attendance.

To meet the needs of developing colleges in the Southeast Region, the PWDI arranged a special conference on the computer that was held April 7 at Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Tifton, Georgia. This workshop, conducted with the cooperation of the AAJC Occupational Education Project and a battery of six consultants, was designed to cover all potential uses of the computer, in both administration and instruction. Limitations as well as potential contributions of the computer were cited.

The format of the workshop included small-group workshops following the initial presentations by consultants. Some conclusions reached: There is no magic in the computer; the small college should avoid it unless it is needed for instruction, and should try to join a cooperative arrangement rather than buy or lease its own; computer-assisted instruction is no better than the material that goes in, and no better than other forms of programmed instruction, but the computer can be programmed for individual differences in instruction and also used for business office and student record-keeping purposes.

The conference was attended by 76 college representatives from eight member and 16 associate colleges. Of 50 participants returning evaluation forms, 16% gave the workshop a "very valuable" rating, 44% deemed it of "considerable value" and 38% of "some value," with one respondent scoring it "little value" on the five-point scale.

Human Relations Workshop

A PWDI-sponsored two-day workshop on human relations systems of student orientation was held May 22-23, 1970, on the campus of Spartanburg Junior College, South Carolina. The workshop was developed and run by personnel of two junior colleges involved in innovative approaches to humanizing education. April O'Connell and Douglas Johnson, Santa Fe Junior College, Gainesville, Florida, demonstrated to small groups of workshop participants a modified "encounter" approach designed to strengthen personal relationships on campus and give students greater confidence in themselves; James McHolland and Roy Trueblood of Kendall College, Evanston, Illinois, provided a demonstration of human potential seminars used with success at Kendall--a more structured method of working with students to develop their self-images and motivate them to succeed in their college programs.

Workshop attendees arranged in small groups worked with both teams, participating in the demonstration of techniques and then evaluating the methods used and their applicability to the junior college educational program.

The workshop was attended by 42 individuals from 23 colleges. Of 38 returning evaluation questionnaires, 21 rated the sessions as "very valuable" and 17 as of "considerable value," with none lower on the five-point scale. An evaluation made by the consultants on the results of the workshop revealed that the participants had individually become more aware of their own strengths, that they generally liked themselves better than before the sessions and that they felt more in touch with their potential as human beings.

The AAJC National Convention

Representatives of many PWDI member colleges were in attendance at the 50th Annual Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges, held March 1-6, 1970, at Honolulu, although this was not in the program as funded by USOE. (In most cases the colleges paid the expenses of their presidents from their own funds.)

PWDI held three breakfast meetings: one with the regional coordinators and advisory committee members to plan a two-day session in April on plans for the coming year; one for representatives of all funded colleges present; and one to plan the Human Relations Workshop.

Participation in the convention also gave some faculty members associated with the program the opportunity to explore many problems of the junior colleges. An International Assembly held prior to the convention had drawn delegates from 18 countries to sessions on the junior college and postsecondary education.

Other Conferences

A number of specialized conferences not sponsored by PWDI but related to the central theme of faculty development, received publicity in the Newsletter. Every effort was made to inform colleges within the program of possible specialized assistance for administrative and faculty personnel. A running list of upcoming conferences thought to be of potential value was carried in the Newsletter's calendar of coming events. Some indication of the extent of college participation in workshops outside the program will be given in the chapter on faculty travel.

VIII.

F A C U L T Y T R A V E L

A prominent feature of the 1969-70 program was the provision for colleges to encourage faculty personnel to make inter-campus visits and attend professional meetings on program funds.

This aspect of the program received the highest of ratings. The final evaluation of the year's program by the colleges reveals the great value attached to faculty travel of this sort: 79% of the respondents said faculty attendance at professional meetings (which they would have otherwise been unable to attend) had been "very valuable" to the college; 19% considered such attendance to have been of "considerable value," with one college rating this type of faculty travel to have been of "some value" and none lower on the five-point scale. In response to the question "How valuable were inter-campus visits?" 72% said they were "very valuable;" 21% said they were of "considerable value;" 7% said "some value," and none were lower on the five-point scale.

The following excerpts from the colleges' mid-year progress reports are representative of the types of activities for which faculty travel was funded:

Harford Junior College, Bel Air, Maryland: The Nursing Division Chairman attended the Southern Regional Education Board Council on Collegiate Education for Nursing in Atlanta. The Business Administration Division Chairman and four faculty members attended a one-day audio-tutorial conference at Columbia U.'s Teachers College. The Director of Student Activities attended a food service conference in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Two faculty members traveled to the audio-tutorial conference at Purdue University. Three faculty members visited the American Council on Education in Washington, D.C. An educational media faculty member attended a three-day A-V conference at the National Association of Educational Broadcasting in Washington. A reading specialist attended a reading conference in Boston and traveled to several Reading Development Centers in Maryland and Delaware to study organizational structures. An educational media faculty member attended a library planning conference at Western Carolina University. The Faculty Council Chairman attended the Great Teachers Seminar in Maine and a counselor attended a student personnel institute at California State College in Los Angeles. All of this travel was financed with Title III funds.

Mount Olive College, Mount Olive, North Carolina: The Mount Olive College faculty has attended workshops and conferences and has visited other campuses as observers of instructional models. Conferences attended by members of the faculty which have been most beneficial in providing exposure to innovative instructional methods include the Vincennes and Myrtle Beach Conferences, the Marymount English Workshop, and the East Carolina University Biological Science Workshop. Campuses visited which provided insight into instructional media include Louisburg College, Mitchell College, and El Centro Community College in Dallas, Texas. A visit to Mitchell College for participation in workshops under Dr. Postlethwait was looked upon by faculty members as quite beneficial.

Lenoir Community College, Kinston, North Carolina: Four instructors visited Central Piedmont Community College for the purpose of studying their computer-assisted instructional installation and procedures. Two instructors attended the PWDI National Conference in Vincennes and also attended the American Library Association Conference in Atlantic City. The PWDI conference at Myrtle Beach, South Carolina was attended by 38 instructors and administrators. An instructor attended the Electromechanical Technology Workshop at the University of Hartford and received additional instruction at Western Illinois University. Two English instructors attended a systems workshop at Marymount College. One English instructor attended a college reading workshop and five instructors attended a reading development workshop in Raleigh. Four instructors attended the audio-tutorial workshop at Mitchell College.

Martin College, Pulaski, Tennessee: Inter-campus visits were scheduled to Mount Vernon Junior College, Washington, D.C. and Santa Fe Junior College in Florida. Twelve faculty members attended the winter workshop at Cumberland College; eight had attended the previous regional meet.

Mobile State Junior College, Mobile, Alabama: Mobile State Junior College was one of fifteen junior colleges participating in an EPDA Leadership Training Program with Auburn University as sponsor. Faculty members were given the advantage of consultation through full faculty participation in this program. An inter-college visit was made to John C. Calhoun State Technical Junior College in Northern Alabama. Student representatives were in attendance at the Region IV Conference at Lebanon, Tennessee, November 2-3, 1969.

Wood Junior College, Mathiston, Mississippi: All of the administrative staff and all faculty members except two attended the first regional meeting at Jackson. The English and mathematics instructors with the academic dean attended a workshop at Meridian Junior College on developmental studies in English and math. The math instructor and the dean visited Coffeyville Community College in Kansas to study their remedial math program. They returned with new ideas for improving the basic math program at Wood.

Plans for the remainder of the year included sending two faculty members to the Human Potential Seminar at Kendall College, two to the Junior College Teachers Seminar in New York and two to an institute at Mississippi State University.

Vincennes University, Vincennes, Indiana: The two-day National Audio-Tutorial Conference at Purdue University was attended by 24 of our faculty members. Three members of the business faculty visited the Business Department of Lansing Community College. Further visits of the Horticultural Technology faculty to Danville Junior College, the Aviation Flight and Mechanics faculties to the FAA Academy at Oklahoma City, and the Food Service Technology people to the annual meeting of the Council on Hotel, Restaurants and Institutional Education not only have provided new information, but have resulted in revisions both in curriculum and in instructional methodology.

Michigan Christian College, Rochester, Michigan: Dr. Vaughn Whited of Oakland Community College spent a half day in consultation at MCC during the fall, followed by a special trip for the entire MCC faculty to Oakland's Auburn Hills campus on November 20. Dr. Whited arranged for the MCC faculty to observe the OCC Learning Center, for individualized tours in various departments and for group sessions to discuss improved educational techniques.

Throughout the fall quarter the college had been considering a conversion of its biology program from the conventional lecture/lab approach to the audio-tutorial method. On December 15 the biology instructor made a personal trip to Purdue University for observation of their biology facilities and additional conferences with Dr. Postlethwait. During the winter quarter the college completely converted its biology classes to the audio-tutorial method.

Eastern Iowa Community College, Muscatine, Iowa: Two instructors from the Humanities Division attended state-wide articulation meetings for their respective departments. Three instructors and the dean attended a regional meeting in Iowa City at which representatives from participating colleges planned with University of Iowa staff members for workshops in five subject matter areas. Two instructors visited campuses at Lincoln, Illinois and Springfield, Illinois, to learn more about their science and math programs. Three science instructors visited Meramec Community College in St. Louis to investigate new methods of teaching chemistry, biology and physics. Other visits were planned to Oakland Community College (individualized instruction) and Oral Roberts University (physical education). The music instructor attended a national music conference in Chicago.

Ellsworth Community College, Iowa Falls, Iowa: Four members of the Biology Department attended the Audio-Tutorial Systems Conference at Purdue University. A college librarian attended the

Library-College Associates Interdisciplinary Conference in Chicago. A college administrator and the chairmen of both the Biology and Psychology Departments visited Mankato State College in Minnesota and analyzed their media program, instructional resources center, and audio-tutorial courses prior to the arrival on campus of two consultants from Mankato State College. The Department of Education and Psychology visited Meramec Community College in St. Louis to tour the dial-access labs in chemistry and biology and the experimental laboratory used in general psychology.

Independence Community Junior College, Independence, Kansas: Two groups have made inter-campus visitations. One group, consisting of the representatives of the fine arts, foreign language, mathematics, speech, and business departments, visited the Florissant Valley and Meramec Community College campuses in St. Louis to observe innovative practices. A second group consisting of English and Literature instructors made a visit to Arapahoe and Northeastern Junior Colleges in Littleton and Sterling, Colorado. These campuses were picked because of innovative developments in English composition that have been occurring on the Northeastern campus and in teaching English to technical students on the Arapahoe campus.

Otero Junior College, La Junta, Colorado: One of the most helpful support items has been that of sending faculty members to various conferences and to other institutions for the resolution of specific problems and instruction. Specifically, the college was able to send: 1) two faculty members to the Vincennes Conference; 2) a staff member to the Greeley Conference on Foundations of Education; 3) a staff member to Fort Collins for instruction in the use of specific electronic equipment for the biology program; 4) a staff member to a regional workshop in Phoenix on Desert Ecology; 5) a psychology staff member to Fort Collins to work on a revision in the general psychology course; 6) an archaeology staff member to a field conference on Southwest archaeology; 7) a physical education staff member to a workshop on physical fitness and 8) a guidance counselor to a workshop on developmental education.

Southwest Texas Junior College, Uvalde, Texas: Faculty members attended a workshop on Mexican culture at the University of the Americas, a workshop in reading at Incarnate Word College, a Sheep Industry Development Program meeting, an English teachers meeting in New Mexico, a Social Studies Conference in Omaha and the National Intramural Conference in Colorado Springs.

IX.

P U B L I C A T I O N S

The Newsletter

The backbone of communications within the Program With Developing Institutions is the PWDI newsletter, Developing Junior Colleges. During the 1968-69 fiscal year 28 issues were published on an irregular schedule, compared to 40 during the preceding 15-month period. The newsletter serves many purposes; it goes to several individuals at most funded colleges, to all associate colleges and consultants, and to others upon request, bringing news of interest to administration and faculty about government programs, regional workshops and other PWDI activities, and successful innovations in the colleges.

In addition, the funded colleges received bundles of newsletters large enough to enable copies to be placed in the mailboxes of all full-time faculty members and administrators. This was done at the request of the regional coordinators, and financed by an allocation of regional funds, $100 per college to expand the original publications budget. About 1700 individual newsletters were sent out during the entire year; the bundles brought the circulation to over 4000, and more than 4500 in the case of a few issues mailed to all junior colleges. At the end of the academic year the bundles were dropped. In addition, return postcards to test continuing interest in receiving the newsletter were mailed to all persons on the mailing list who were not on the staff of a PWDI member or associate college or a nonprofit educational institution. If they failed to reply, they were removed from the list.

The newsletter was ranked high in the evaluation by funded colleges, but not quite as high as the first year (when the frequency of issues was slightly higher). The ratings were as follows:

EVALUATION OF DEVELOPING JUNIOR COLLEGES NEWSLETTER

	1968-69 (85 colleges)	1969-70 (53 colleges)
Very Valuable	72%	53%
Considerable Value	26%	34%
Some Value	2%	11%
Little Value	-	2%
No Value	-	-

Letters were sent to the persons at seven colleges who rated the newsletter as being of less than "considerable value." The letters said:

> In our year-end analysis of the Program With Developing Institutions, we note that you gave a low rating to our newsletter, Developing Junior Colleges, and would be interested in receiving any suggestions you might have for improvement of the newsletter. We want to make the newsletter as valuable as we can for all our member and associate colleges; therefore any suggestions you might make would be very much appreciated.

Following are representative comments from letters of college coordinators who had replied to this supplementary query by the time this report went to press:

> We did not mean to give the impression that in itself the newsletter deserved a low rating. Instead, we meant that in comparison with the other aspects of the PWDI the newsletter was of less overall value to our college....One suggestion to make the newsletter even more valuable would be to maximize the time between the announcement and the date of a workshop. The first announcement of a workshop should not just be in the calendar on the back page, but should be in the body of the newsletter with a brief description of who, what, when, where, and why. The calendar on the back page should be continued, but could be improved by including references to the newsletter in which the announcement of a meeting was first given.
>
> -Richard C. Elliott, Coordinator
> Truett McConnell College

> The rating of "Some Value" assigned to the newsletter, Developing Junior Colleges, was not intended to be a criticism of the publication. I have no suggestions for its improvement. The rating of "Some Value" which was given this component follows the rationale that as an isolated part of the program--and standing on its own merits--its value to our participating college is not as great as several other components.
>
> -Ora E. Roades, Dean
> Wharton County Junior College

An item analysis of the newsletter is given in the following section.

Content of News Stories, Developing Junior Colleges, 1969-70

The following table indicates the types of news stories which were featured in the Developing Junior Colleges Newsletter, for Fiscal Year 1969-70 (July 1, 1969 to June 30, 1970). Examples of news stories follow the table for clarification.

	No. of stories
General news of junior colleges	8
News of junior college programs	9
U. S. Office of Education	7
American Association of Junior Colleges:	
Meetings	11
General News	11
Program With Developing Institutions:	
Meetings (including regional)	27
Workings of program	16
News about PWDI colleges:	
Member	42
Associate	27
Specialized meetings and workshops of other organizations	22
Publications:	
AAJC & PWDI	13
"Book Notes" and other publications	7
Special features	9
Legislation (stories to keep junior colleges aware of pertinent legislation)	15
Application deadlines	5
Consortium activities	7
Educational technology	6
Miscellaneous stories	5
"Quotable quotes"	3
Coming events	26

General news of junior colleges included stories on Canadian Project Plans Exchanges, New Junior College Research Group, and Private Colleges Hold their own in Enrollment.

News of junior college programs included such stories as Junior College European Study Tour, "New Careers" Covers Varied Programs, and Maryland Program to train Anti-Pollution Technicians.

U.S. Office of Education stories--Special Community/Junior College Consultant at U.S.O.E., Secretary Finch Outlines Community College Plans, and EPDA Grants Announced.

American Association of Junior Colleges included stories on the Federal Affairs Workshops, the Occupational Education Conferences, the Computer Workshops, and the AAJC-AVA Workshop. General stories on AAJC included the Social Science Project, "The Now Colleges" Widely Used, the AAJC Convention and Charles Chapman Elected President of AAJC.

Program With Developing Institutions included 13 stories on various regional conferences, and several stories each on Seminar Workshops on New Learning Techniques, Human Relations Workshops, and the Multi-Regional Conference at St. Louis. Stories on the workings of the Program--PWDI Advisors' Meetings, Consulting Team Recommendations, A Note to Consultants, and various information on planning for the third year program. News about member and associate colleges included information gained by visits to the field and information sent to the PWDI office.

Specialized meetings and workshops included: Audio-Tutorial Conferences at Purdue, Two-Year College Chemistry Conference, Mexican-American Afro-American Curriculum Workshop, National Conference on Accreditation of Occupational Education, and many others.

Publications which were mentioned included In-Service Training Guide, Strategy for Change in the Junior College, Focus on Action, Teachers for the Real World, by B. Othanel Smith, and Preparing Instructional Objectives by Robert F. Mager.

Special Features included "How Do you Turn a Student On?", by James Kiser; "Students Form Task Force on Vietnam," by Brent Smith; "A Teacher Speaks Out," by Barbara Goleman; and "Schools, 2001," from the CTA Journal.

Legislation stories featured were Hearings on the Williams Bill, Higher Education Project Development Act of 1970, President Signs Rise in GI School Benefits, and various stories to keep junior colleges abreast of federal funding.

Application deadlines were published for such programs as Allied Health Professions Grants, Special Services to the Disadvantaged, and Cooperative Education.

Activities of Consortia in Kentucky, Puerto Rico, and Texas were featured.

Educational Technology stories included Technological Innovation: Casettes; Student Mastery of Course Materials; and Individualized Instruction: Generic Definition and Model for Teachers.

Miscellaneous stories included "Ye Novice's Guide to Current Acronyms," Chicago TV College Films, and White House Seeks Fellows.

Monographs

Because of restricted budgets for publications and for specialized workshops, only three monographs were published by the program in its second year, compared to five in 1968-69. These were:

(1) Developing Institutions: The Junior College, the first interim report on the program, covering the activities of the 1968-69 program and its evaluation;

(2) Strategy for Change in the Junior College, the selected proceedings of the second national conference held at Vincennes University, Indiana, in June 1969; and

(3) Directory of Consultants and Advisors (First Edition in August 1969, Second Edition in May 1970, and undergoing constant revision.)-This was distributed to all PWDI funded and associate colleges and is being widely used.

Monographs were not published on other specialized conferences, but summaries were published in the newsletter. Participants in the "SALT" seminars took away with them a large workbook of materials.

X.

ASSOCIATE COLLEGES

Provision for "associate status" in the Program With Developing Institutions was again made during the second year of operation. Junior colleges wishing to receive associate membership in the program were directed to apply to the central office and also to notify the regional coordinator in their region of the country. The ranks of the associate colleges swelled during the 1969-70 program year from slightly over 200 to a total of 321 at year's end. A complete listing of all associate colleges as of June 30, 1970, appears in Appendix B.

Associate colleges received the "Developing Junior Colleges" Newsletter and all PWDI monographs free of charge. In addition, they were invited to attend, at their own expense, national and regional conferences and specialized workshops sponsored by the program. And a great many did so: representatives from 14 associate colleges attended the Vincennes National Conference; 35 associate colleges were represented in the four SALT seminars; 16 attended the Computer Workshop held at Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College and nine were in attendance at the Spartanburg Human Relations Workshop. Associate colleges were encouraged to participate in all regional activities, and to utilize, when possible, the services of consultants visiting nearby funded colleges.

One indication of the active involvement of associate colleges in the program is the funding of several such colleges for participation in the Planning and Development Project of the 1970-71 program. Associate status is seen by some junior colleges as a step toward funding, but this is not necessarily true. Many associates are not eligible for funding under Title III for various reasons. Some are less than five years old, some are not considered needy enough and some are not able to seek accreditation for technical reasons. But in all cases, associate colleges have asked for this relationship with the Program With Developing Institutions. The associate classification has been a vehicle for spreading, in a small way, benefits of the program to a much larger group than could otherwise participate in its activities.

XI.

GENERAL EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

As noted in Chapter II, a final evaluation questionnaire on the 1969-70 program revealed that 68% of the 53 funded colleges gave the program a rating of "very valuable," and another 30% rated it as of "considerable value." Thus 98% of the colleges gave the program one of the two highest ratings (compared to 95% last year). One college judged the program to have been of "some value," with none lower on the five-point scale.

The colleges were then asked to evaluate various significant facets of the 1969-70 program. Much of this evaluative information was incorporated in the previous chapters of this report and a tabular summary of evaluation figures appears in Appendix D.

Inter-campus visits and the opportunity for faculty personnel to attend professional meetings on program funds, both new features in this year's program, received the highest ratings. 72% of the colleges rated the former as having been "very valuable," with 79% giving the highest rating to the latter, as noted earlier.

In continuing facets of the program, the evaluation ratings reveal a marked similarity to the ratings given last year, as far as the two top ratings are concerned. In general there were fewer "very valuable" ratings given, but the number of lower ratings also declined. A comparison of the two national conferences at Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia, and at Vincennes University, yields an equal percentage giving the two top ratings, but with fewer "very valuable" ratings for the conference at Vincennes. In evaluating the regional workshops, the percentage giving one of the two top ratings increased from 85% to 92% from last year, but again there were fewer "very valuable" ratings given.

Receiving less favorable ratings in comparison with last year were the Developing Junior Colleges Newsletter and the Seminars on Systems and Advanced Learning Technologies. The percentage giving the newsletter one of the two higher ratings fell from 98% to 87%. The "SALT" Seminars, rated either "very valuable" or of "considerable value" by 63% of the colleges and 59% of the individual seminar participants, received significantly lower ratings than the various special conferences in the first year's program. These comparisons are spelled out in greater detail in Chapter V.

Some 92% of colleges in the 1969-70 program gave consultants' visits a favorable rating, comparing with 91% the previous year with those judging the visits to have been "very valuable" slightly higher

than last year. Individual visits by consultants were, however, rated somewhat lower than last year. The evaluative information on consultants appears in Chapter IV.

The colleges were also asked in the questionnaire to evaluate the facets of this year's program as to their value to the college in future programs, thus also giving some indication of the value attached to this year's program. The results appear as follows:

Question: Which of the following do you anticipate would be of greatest value to your college in future programs? (Number 1,2,3,4, in order of preference:)

Feature of Program	Ranking 1	2	3	4	5
Additional workshops	19	17	11	2	0
Additional consultants on campus	6	9	18	6	2
More inter-campus visits	34	15	1	1	0
Additional person(s) to attend AAJC convention	2	5	8	23	3
Other (specify) [see below]	(2)		(3)	(2)	

The results here confirm the high degree of value placed on inter-campus visits. A desire for additional workshops was also revealed, as was the lower premium on having additional consultants visit the campus.

When asked what kind of additional workshops were desired, the college respondents listed the following:

Disadvantaged programs (3)
Departmental or by discipline (3)
Educational media (3)
Teaching innovations (2)
Improvement of instruction(2)
Audio-tutorial techniques (2)
Federal funding
Counseling techniques
Black studies
Computer-aided instruction
Administration
Group planning
Curriculum development
Characteristics of students

When queried as to other features they would like to see added to the program, respondents cited on-campus study for faculty, expansion of the newsletter, more on-campus workshops, more funding for attendance of faculty at professional meetings and provision for additional National Teaching Fellows.

College Comments

The following comments were sent in by college representatives (the president or coordinator) in answer to question #10 of the questionnaire, which read as follows: "Please state which aspect of the Program With Developing Institutions has been most valuable to you and cite in narrative form your most interesting and significant experience with the program." The final questionnaire was sent to colleges in April. In a few instances, where no narrative evaluation was sent back, excerpts from a mid-year progress report were used as a substitute.

REGION ONE - NORTHEAST

Harford Junior College (Maryland): Most valuable to us were several inter-campus visitations such as attendance at an A-T conference at Purdue University by two of our faculty members after which we were able to design and set up an audio-tutorial approach in the teaching of science.

Cape Cod Community College (Massachusetts): The most interesting and significant experience for me has been to witness the gradual change in attitude toward the PWDI by the Cape Cod faculty. Initially, the project was greeted by many faculty members with indifference and skepticism. But as more and more of our faculty visited other campuses and reported back to the entire faculty at unstructured faculty meetings, this attitude changed to one of growing interest.

Most of our faculty have made their classrooms more student-centered. We have instigated a free attendance system in response to the student body's request. Students are now active members of all standing committees but one. Several faculty members have adopted the systems approach in their courses. The objectives and general structure of a new course in Modern Poetry are being written by the students in the course. This instructor visited Kendall College under the PWDI. We hope that the most significant experience for all is yet to come at our Cape Cod Faculty Workshop.

Catonsville Community College (Maryland):
In the June to December period of 1969, the College had planned and executed five major events and helped the College develop understanding and methodologies necessary for the College's and its staff's growth. PWDI funds sent three College members to the Vincennes Conference in June, funded a faculty-staff retreat on faculty evaluation and organizational changes in July, funded a trip for four of the faculty to Purdue University to the Audio-Tutorial Systems Program in October, funded a follow-up retreat of the Academic Staff and Divisional Chairmen on instructional methodologies and organizational changes, and provided for increased cooperation in program sharing with Essex Community College at a joint retreat at Donaldson Brown in November.

The College planned and undertook participation for the second half of the year in the Sterling Institute Conference, inter-campus visits for the Humanities Division and faculty members beginning to work with ETV, and hosted visits by consultants in the Chemistry, English and Business Divisions.

Norwalk Community College (Connecticut): Being part of a national consortium with the resultant exchange of ideas at conferences and meetings has been beneficial.

The newsletter and publications and the services of the AAJC staff have been commendable.

Suggestions for improvements in next year's program would include the need for more activity in our region and more participation by associate colleges.

REGION TWO - THE CAROLINAS

Mount Olive College (North Carolina): Of all of the PWDI opportunities this year for the faculty and staff of Mount Olive College, I believe that the visitation to other campuses, either through workshops or for the purpose of observation, has been the most valuable. This evaluation does not minimize the value of the institutes, visitation to our campus by consultants, or other activities; however, I feel that the opportunities to observe innovative instructional methods have rendered the greatest benefit to our faculty.

There have been several activities in which our students have been involved. The consortium student conference held on our campus in February has been a highlight of the year, in that students discussed ways and means for improvement in faculty-student relations. Of all the single events this year, this conference stands the highest, both from the viewpoint of our own students who were in attendance and what I believe students from the other five institutions carried home with them.

In retrospect for the year, I must give a very positive evaluation of the variety of projects under the PWDI grant.

Chowan College (North Carolina): Perhaps one of the most beneficial aspects of this program has been the enabling of our institution to bring to the campus consultants in both the areas of academics and student personnel work. Most of the consultants could not have been obtained without the financial support of AAJC/PWDI. In the area of academics, the greatest consultant value has been observed in remedial programs and by the Department of Science-Mathematics.

Many of our faculty have attended workshops this year that they could not have attended without AAJC/PWDI support. Perhaps the two departments which have benefited most from this experience are English and Nursing.

It has been particularly interesting to note a gradual change of attitude on the part of many faculty members. In the early stages of the program this year, there was great opposition on the part of some faculty members to some of the concepts being discussed. As the year progressed, however, there has been a marked change of attitude.

Lenoir Community College (North Carolina): Of most significance were visits to other campuses by our instructors. We now have one group working on systems and instructional accountability. One group is working on audio-tutorial packages. We have also created a skills lab for disadvantaged students and an outreach program for unemployed adults---all because of ideas gained by our instructors.

Mitchell College (North Carolina): The most valuable aspect of the 1969-70 PWDI, on our campus, has been the visitation of our faculty to other institutions, agencies, conferences, and workshops that they would not have had the privilege to attend otherwise. Their experiences have provided new understanding of higher education in general, and total new concepts of themselves, their own teaching situations, and most importantly, a fresh new concept of their students. All of this has been evidenced in their improved and much more dynamic teaching.

Visiting consultants--our campus has been given a "real shot in the arm" with the "experts" we have been able to bring to our campus through this program. This has been the beginning for many of our teachers.

Publications provided by the program through AAJC have kept our faculty abreast of current happenings in education, and specifically in two-year institutions of higher education.

North Greenville Junior College (South Carolina): The simple act of getting us out of isolation and into contact with others who are faced with similar problems has been the greatest single factor.

The increased use of audio-visual materials, programmed texts, and especially the overhead projector and the cassette recorder has been stimulated after the workshop we held with Dr. Morris Norfleet.

Peace College (North Carolina): The regional conference was probably the most valuable experience. The most interesting experience was the teaching approach taken at the workshop with the Sterling Institute (SALT).

PWDI has enabled the Peace College faculty to realize its desire for greater professional development by the attendance of faculty and staff at professional meetings, seminars and workshops, and by visits to other college campuses. The faculty has evaluated our participation in PWDI and found it to be of considerable value in the development of the curriculum and also towards the development of their own professional growth.

REGION THREE - SOUTHEAST

Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College (Georgia): National, regional and faculty workshops have been of considerable value to our institution. They have provided the stimulation by which many of our instructors have become interested in moving into the mainstream of academic life. Faculty members have raised their professional goals and many have returned, or desire to return, to school for advanced training or higher degrees.

New interest has been aroused in more adequately meeting the needs of all students. The College's philosophy has changed from a liberal arts orienation to one of comprehensiveness.

Admission policies have been amended to provide more nearly for an open-door policy, and new career programs have been initiated.

Andrew College (Georgia) (Responses from individual faculty members):

I am re-using standard equipment again (tapes, projector, slides). I have begun to use closed circuit television for evaluation of myself and new tape recorders which are also used by students in the library. I feel like a new teacher because I now have a broader approach in my teaching.

Perhaps the greatest benefit has been an awareness that we are not necessarily behind in current educational practices and ideas just because of the fact that we are not in a strategic geographical area. Thanks to the opportunity we have been given to have consultants come to our campus and the opportunity to visit other campuses and attend educational meetings, we are more aware of trends and up-to-date practices in education.

One of the most meaningful experiences in my entire educational career came when Miss Griffin and I visited Spartanburg Junior College. The purpose of this visit was to observe their "pre-college" program for "high-risk" students in action. From this visit I gained ideas and an insight as to how we could revise and expand our own program so that it would be more effective.

For the first time in years I was encouraged to be experimental in my classroom approach. Perhaps what I am trying to say is that without Title III funds, I would not still be teaching; or if I were, I would have still been caught in the dull routine of daily classroom work, still agonizing over my seeming inability to evaluate my performance and the students' performance, and still teaching the same things in the same old boring way.

Since I deal in a skill area of teaching (music), the purchase of the closed circuit television has been one of the finest investments that has been undertaken at Andrew College. This equipment has been of very great importance in showing the student his actual physical appearance as well as the sound that is being produced, be it vocal or instrumental.

Our participation in the Title III Program has helped to make "dreams" become a reality.

DeKalb College (Georgia): The 1969-70 Program With Developing Institutions has been most valuable (1) by providing a new combination of resources to meet the growth and development problems confronting the community college, (2) as the catalytic agent for focusing the talents within the college on new approaches, and (3) as the vehicle for sustaining activities throughout the year.

The faculty has benefited from the provocative presentations of general consultants. They caused a reassessment of attitudes toward students and their characteristics, capabilities, and limitations; they caused also an examination of a greater variety of

teaching techniques and approaches. Regional and campus conferences supported and sustained the interests and concerns generated by the pre-planning workshops. Inter-campus visits and professional meetings provided contacts which would not have been possible outside PWDI.

It is the consensus of faculty, administration, and the Faculty Development Committee that more progress has occurred, that attitudes have been more significantly changed, and that more understandings of the role of the junior college have evolved in the short period covered by the PWDI grant than in the previous history of the college.

Emmanuel College (Georgia): All aspects have been valuable. Consultants have been helpful to the extent that they took time to learn about our college instead of merely presenting a canned speech. Intercampus visits are proving helpful. The National Vincennes Conference helped stimulate key faculty members. Most of the consultants have been helpful. Intercampus visitations have given new ideas in some cases. In other instances, faculty members have returned to our campus recognizing that they are performing better than those observed. The equipment purchased has stimulated new approaches that will be reported on at a later time. The regional workshop provided interaction with other instructors and information.

The most significant experience was a faculty workshop conducted by our faculty for two days at the Georgia Baptist Assembly Grounds, Toccoa, Georgia. There was a spirit of cooperativeness that is seldom equalled.

Gordon Military College (Georgia): During our first year of faculty development under PWDI, the many consultants we used were extremely valuable to us. With our small faculty and student body, we found that this approach enabled us to continue classes and share consultants' ideas not only with faculty, but in many instances with students. Another year, however, we should like to devote more energy, time, and funds to visiting other campuses.

Reinhardt College (Georgia): The workshops and consultant visits have been the most valuable aspect. The financial support received under the program has enabled us to employ additional teachers, make grants for faculty study, have professional contacts and catch a new vision of our opportunity to be of service to all types of students. We feel that this program has also encouraged the friends of the college who are contributing to capital development, scholarships and current support. The program is putting us nearer to the mainstream of academic life.

Truett McConnell College (Georgia): The most valuable aspect of the 1969-70 Program With Developing Institutions has been the opportunity for our faculty members to attend workshops and professional meetings. Truett McConnell College has not in the past been able to help its faculty to take part in professional meetings. Recognizing the lasting influence of such meetings, we are using Title III funds to make it possible for every faculty member to attend a meeting of his professional

organization. Thirty percent of the faculty have already availed themselves of this opportunity. We are convinced that this use of the Title III funds will have a significant and enduring impact on the total college program.

Southern Baptist College (Arkansas): The program has given tremendous benefits to Southern Baptist College. We assure you that it has been very helpful in our work here. We believe it has been rewarding to the entire higher educational system of the nation.

REGION FOUR - MIDDLE SOUTH

Cumberland College (Tennessee): The most interesting and significant phase was the opportunity to confer with the consultants and to have the benefit of their experiences. The visits by these consultants enabled all of our faculty to confer individually with them, and by doing so we feel that our program has been enriched. The opportunity we have had to visit other colleges and to participate in the regional and national conferences has been of great value.

Copiah-Lincoln Junior College (Mississippi): The meeting at Cumberland College, Lebanon, Tennessee, November 2-3, 1969, was very good. There seemed to be a level of communication that made the material have meaning in our local situations. I feel that the consultants were interested in and knew the program of the junior college. There were several demonstrations made at this meeting that have been very helpful in meeting the needs of teaching situations here at Copiah-Lincoln Junior College.

The Pre-school Workshop held on our campus was of great value to us. It placed emphasis on the use of educational media--visual aids in teaching, group sessions on philosophy and objectives of the junior college, and problems pertinent to our own situation.

We honestly feel that the Program With Developing Institutions has been one of the most useful programs to Copiah-Lincoln Junior College that we have had in several years. We have appreciated the opportunity to participate in this program and hope to be included in the future program.

Martin College (Tennessee): Workshops close to home where all persons in a particular discipline could attend--provided some provocative, experienced educational authority is leader of the workshop sessions--are most valuable. Young, inexperienced persons, even though they have the PhD. degree, provoke an attitude of resistance to all change. Persons who point out the pitfalls, as well as the virtues of an innovative practice, are very helpful.

Our faculty has been inspired by the optimistic outlook and the dedication of so many leaders in education; they have also been encouraged by the willingness of some college administrators to attempt new ways of teaching.

Mississippi Delta Junior College: The most valuable part of the program has been that it allowed many of the instructors to visit other schools and agencies and gain an insight into many of the innovations that are taking place today in higher education.

Without this program such an undertaking would have been impossible. In addition, the visiting consultants provided valuable aid in helping the teachers develop better instructional programs as well as adopting a more positive attitude toward the general philosophy of the junior college.

Mobile State Junior College (Alabama): In my opinion, the faculty development program in which Mobile State Junior College participated as a member of the Middle South Consortium was the most valuable collective experience for the College during the year 1969-70. The essential feature of this program was its provision for decentralizing by which the local schools played a major role in deciding their local programs.

Morristown College (Tennessee): Possibly the most outstanding aspect of the 1969-70 program was the workshop held on our campus with the entire faculty involved and directed by our consultant, Dr. Clarke, and the campus coordinator. Dr. Clarke concentrated on two days of faculty enrichment and developed an institutional pride among the faculty. The enthusiasm has carried throughout the year.

The regional approach to geographic similarities and faculty sharing has been most helpful. The cooperation of the member institutions in the region has been outstanding.

Northwest Alabama State Junior College: Northwest Alabama State has sought to gain skills in behavioral objective writing among its faculty. With Dr. Seymour, our chief consultant's help, we were able to unify the AAJC Program in Faculty Development with a Title III bilateral grant program with the University of Alabama, holding a series of workshops in behavioral objective writing that were supplemented by the very fine series of PWDI regional workshops. The dean, the division chairmen, and faculty members were able to exercise more leadership as a result of regional workshops attended by both faculty and division chairmen.

Southwest Mississippi Junior College: The faculty orientation workshop at the beginning of the school year projected the program for the year. An excellent program was presented by Dr. Drewry and Dr. Diener. The regional meeting at Cumberland College in November provided an excellent orientation for many of our faculty members, who had not previously been involved in this type of activity. The Federal Affairs Workshop at the University of Florida provided much needed assistance in preparation of applications for governmental funds.

Wood Junior College (Mississippi): The regional conferences at Jackson in August and Cumberland in November have been highlights. At these two workshops, we were able to get down to some individual problems. The resource people for both these workshops were very helpful--they each had important information to share and in most cases they did a fine job. These workshops were large enough to bring a wide spectrum of consultants and participants, yet small enough to deal with individual problems.

REGION FIVE - MIDWEST

Vincennes University (Indiana): As far as Vincennes University is concerned, this project has been very stimulating for our faculty. A number of them have been greatly stimulated by workshops and visitations as numerous members of our faculty have made most helpful visits to other campuses.

Belleville Junior College (Illinois): Up to this point our most interesting and valuable experiences have been in the participation by faculty members in various workshops. We will continue to participate in the workshops, and plan a number of inter-campus visitations as well. Also, a faculty orientation program is planned for the fall from the current year's funds.

Black Hawk College (Illinois): The most significant aspect of the College has been the ability to provide visitations to other colleges to see the "innovative" programs and techniques carried on. These visits proved instrumental in development of our own programs. Faculty members contend that they learned what not to do as well as what to try.

My most significant experience was with the regional seminar on Systems and Advanced Learning Technologies. The actual involvement in the presentations, and visually seeing what is being done, or can be done, was a tremendous and awakening experience.

I would rank second, thus far, the orientation presented by Dr. Canfield, who has the ability to persuade, anger, and otherwise maybe shame faculty into realizing that they have been sitting still.

Joliet Junior College (Illinois): I believe that the most helpful aspects of the 1969-70 Program With Developing Institutions have been the visitations to other campuses and the workshops made possible. The two departments at Joliet Junior College that have done the most to take advantage of PWDI funds are English and biological sciences. A developmental laboratory is one result of visitations, conferences, and consultant service.

Following the October conference at Purdue, three members of our biological sciences' faculty came to see President Rowley and presented (with the use of an overhead projector) their plans for introducing the audio-tutorial approach into the teaching of biology. The presentation was so fine that the men were asked to give it at a

faculty meeting. One of the results has been the employment of a multi-media director who, with the assistance of our curriculum coordinator, will conduct a workshop two weeks before the opening of school in September. Consultants from other institutions will also be invited to participate.

We have found that the enthusiasm of these groups has spread to others. Every department has profited in some way.

Lansing Community College (Michigan): We have scheduled instructional development, in-service training, inter-campus visits and consultant visits to our campus during the summer months.

Michigan Christian Junior College: Without doubt the most valuable dimension of PWDI during the 1969-70 year has been the visit and subsequent contacts with Dr. Sam Postlethwait. In addition to his conducting a full day's workshop on campus early in the year, our faculty members have had opportunity through the year to be in contact with him. As a result, we have already instituted the audio-tutorial approach in our biology program, and other faculty members in various disciplines are preparing behavioral objectives in connection with their instruction. AT methods or parts of such an approach are being utilized by instructors.

Dr. Paul Faulkner's workshop with the faculty in late May added toward total faculty development in that it dealt considerably with faculty interpersonal relationships. It strengthened the mutual relationships between teachers, provided interpersonal understanding, and better acceptance of each other.

Suomi College (Michigan): The most valuable aspect of the PWDI program was the sharing in cooperative activities between member colleges in the Consortium. We found that significant changes in faculty development could be made by:

-involving a significant number of faculty in inter-campus visits to "lively" institutions and sharing mutual problems.

-bringing dynamic people involved in change programs to the campus.

-encouragement in our own faculty workshop on campus as a post-session.

-participation by our faculty in systems and learning technology workshop.

-participation by selected faculty members in advanced training in seminars such as that of Great Teachers, etc.

-conferences at Vincennes and Lafayette, Indiana were very valuable; especially the one on instructional objectives was most profitable.

REGION SIX - NORTHWEST

Eastern Iowa Community College - Muscatine Campus: The most significant contribution of the PWDI program to our college was the Purdue workshop. Although such techniques were not entirely new to us, as far as information

was concerned, there was much that was new compared with our present practice. The stimulus provided at that workshop was tremendous. As a result, we plan to have our Director of Instructional Media develop one of his courses along a similar pattern, and, with his help, have other instructors do the same thing for appropriate courses, thereby bringing to our college and students opportunities and advantages that have been experienced by others who have done this.

Another objective for next year, also an outgrowth of this workshop, is the writing of behavior objectives which we believe will result in improved instruction.

Eastern Iowa Community College, Clinton Campus: The funding available for our faculty to travel to conferences and meetings in their own subject matter areas was of most value. This year our campus budget was too tight to permit much traveling, but the PWDI Title III funds for faculty development made it possible for faculty to attend many worthwhile meetings and conferences that they would not have been able to have attended otherwise.

Generally, the competence of the consultants and speakers has been excellent.

The Federal Programs Workshop in Chicago on April 2 and 3, 1970, was very helpful to us.

Ellsworth Community College (Iowa): Since our emphasis in faculty development has been on improvement in instruction through change, I believe the conference on "New Learning Technologies" at Purdue and the visitation by our Department of Education and Psychology to Meramec Community College in St. Louis, have been most valuable to the people who participated.

My own most interesting experience with the program this year was the conference at Vincennes University on "Strategy for Change in the Junior College."

Mesabi State Junior College (Minnesota): Generally, our faculty members would agree that the most positive feature of the Program With Developing Institutions (as compared with last year) has been the increased level of local control of funds and planning. This has allowed for the flexibility needed to assure that the unique needs of Mesabi State Junior College, as identified by our own faculty and administration, have determined the direction and scope of the program. As a result, we have been able to emphasize the multi-media approach to learning. Instructors, librarians, media personnel, and counselors have broadened their exposure to this concept through such workshops as the "New Learning Technologies" seminar at Purdue University, the "Libraries in Transition" institute at Evanston, the "Small College Computing Symposium" at the University of North Dakota, the "Upper Mississippi Media Conference", and the "New Dimensions for College Reading and Study Programs" conference in Chicago.

Ottumwa Heights College (Iowa): Of most significance to us were:

Ideas of innovative and/or effective teaching methods and methods of self-evaluation gained at workshops and conventions.

Mutual sharing and reassurance on part of instructors in somewhat same setting and in similar disciplines through correspondence and campus visitations.

Exposure of teachers and students in inner-city culture through consultants and visits to a pre-addict center, night court, and inner core areas. This was effective in teaching urban problems.

REGION SEVEN - PLAINS

Dodge City Community Junior College (Kansas): The increase in intercampus visits and visits of individual professors made possible by this program was its highlight for Dodge City Community College. The program also made it possible to coordinate activities of our Committee on Improvement of Instruction, a standing committee on our campus.

Coffeyville Community Junior College (Kansas): The most significant aspects of the program on our campus were:

(a) continued professional growth of our faculty,

(b) the opportunity for the faculty to attend meetings at Vincennes and La Junta during the past summer, and the opportunities to exchange ideas with colleagues.

The meetings with consultant Don Stewart were revealing, as he has the ability to bring about thinking on the part of the faculty. The program has been great.

Hutchinson Community Junior College (Kansas): The most valuable aspects of the 1969-70 program for Hutchinson Community Junior College were the utilization of consultant services, the contact with other institutional programs by instructional staff, and the experiences gained at the National AAJC Conference in Honolulu, Hawaii, by members of the Board of Trustees.

Seven consultants were brought on campus for one or more visits on such subjects as planning for improvement, evaluation techniques, media utilization, developmental programs, and audio-tutorial instruction.

Local faculty representatives gained valuable insight and experience by visiting over twenty fellow institutions to observe innovative activity, and by attending a number of workshops and conferences.

A genuine contribution of the project occurred in that support was provided for three members of the Board of Trustees to attend the national convention in Honolulu. A broadening of perspective relating to the Board members' role in fostering improved instructional programs has been pronounced.

Independence Community Junior College (Kansas): Our first consultants indicated a definite provincialism on the part of our staff. Through inter-campus visitation and consultants' visits we have been able to modify these attitudes to some degree.

The attitudes of the instructors must change before we can develop changes in instructional patterns. We have noted a decisive shift toward acceptance of behavioral objectives; however, we have a long way to go to have these principles established as soundly as it is desired to have them.

Kansas City Kansas Community Junior College: The most valuable aspect has been the increased contact with other institutions. The effect on the division chairmen has been most noticeable in that they have instigated changes in curriculum and in methods within their respective departments. It has been almost infectious.

Some deep study of problem areas has resulted. Hopefully, what they have learned and what they have seen will have profound effects as we plan our move to enlarged facilities.

It was slow in coming, but a definite shift in philosophy, objectives and methodology is now apparent.

Otero Junior College (Colorado): One of the major events supported by the PWDI program was our summer workshop which was held at Otero. While the workshop was rather generally oriented, we felt that it did provide the stimulus for a number of faculty members to start exploring their own specific areas and to work for some major revisions in the program.

In addition to the foregoing, the Program With Developing Institutions grant has provided the support to enable Professors Shay, Malik and Carline of the University of Colorado to assist us in the planning of our Directed Studies Program. Last Fall we enrolled over 600 students in this program. We have raised reading levels on an average of three years after the first quarter and we have been able to cut the failure rate for incoming freshmen by about forty per cent.

Rangely College (Colorado): The most useful aspect was the freedom to "do our own thing." That is, we were able to suit our participation to meet the particular needs of this college. AAJC resources were a wonderful help in setting a general structure and in giving us specific guidance to carry out our ideas.

REGION EIGHT - SOUTHWEST

Lee College (Texas): The "cross-pollination effect" has been cited again and again as the most dynamic aspect of this program. Contacts with consultants, inter-campus and professional trips, and regional leadership seminars and workshops have helped to move our college into the mainstream of what is happening around the country.

Kilgore College (Texas): Kilgore College used PWDI funds to sponsor a "Guided Self Analysis" course for twenty faculty members this spring. By use of the video-tape recorder, they were able to take a good "inner look" at the goings-on in their classrooms. The interest which this course has generated on our campus has been by far our greatest asset from the PWDI.

Oklahoma Military Academy: On Dr. Alciatore's first visit with our Faculty Development Committee, he spoke for nearly two hours in informal and conversational tones. Virtually each sentence suggested a topic for research, study, and development with primary attention to the current status of the institution.

The Vincennes Conference which followed then lifted the horizons of the participants to reveal new potentials for their own institutions as well as their place in the scheme of things nationally.

The Washington Conference on Federal Affairs was most valuable in the identification of funding sources.

For our own personnel, the stimulus from hosting a multi-state conference will have lasting benefit (SALT conference).

Southwest Texas Junior College: The faculty development program has been valuable to us in that it has allowed our faculty to attend important conferences throughout the country. Many of these trips would not be possible otherwise. This helps a great deal in counteracting the provincialism which is present in this area.

Leadership conferences have been of great value to administrators and teaching faculty.

Texarkana College (Texas): The AAJC/PWDI Newsletter is of great value in helping the college to keep abreast of the latest legislation, conferences, etc. that are taking place in this fast moving, dynamic community college field.

The SALT Conference at the Oklahoma Military Academy, even with the shortcomings of the Sterling Institute presentation may have introduced a potential "breakthrough" of real significance at Texarkana College. With follow-up investigations concerning the feasibility of applying the systems approach to the teaching of economics at Texarkana College, there is a possibility of bringing about, at last, a real innovative improvement in teaching technique.

Texas Southmost College: The following aspects of the 1969-70 PWDI Faculty Development Project were especially valuable to the faculty of Texas Southmost College:

1. Attendance and participation by most of the TSC faculty in the Region VIII Consortium Fall Workshop on "Improving Professional Performance" at Austin had the greatest single impact on the faculty and institution of any of the activities related to PWDI occurring thus far this year. A majority of those participating considered the topics and resource personnel to be both relevant and interesting. A secondary benefit gained by the faculty through attending the workshop came as a result of the faculty traveling by chartered bus to and from

Austin. This provided an excellent opportunity for the faculty from the various departments and divisions to become better acquainted and to discuss further some of the ideas produced by the workshop.

2. The second most valuable activity related to the PWDI project was the "Faculty Orientation Program" which was held during the first week of September, 1969, at which time Dr. Joe Rushing met with the faculty in a series of sessions designed to acquaint the new (and old) faculty with the philosophies and purposes of the junior college, and the implications the implementation of these philosophies and purposes has for the faculty.

3. Next in importance was the attendance by a majority of the faculty of the Annual Convention of the Texas Junior College Teachers Association in Austin. This was the first time that funds had been available to provide all faculty with an opportunity to attend a statewide meeting of a professional association. Again, the chartering of a bus for the trip was a worthwhile experience in itself.

Wharton County Junior College (Texas): The two Instructional Media Workshops conducted on campus have probably involved more instructors and had more generally beneficial results than any other project.

The inter-campus visits have enabled several instructors in key roles to observe educational programs in operation. These visitations, for example, have been very helpful to a faculty committee engaged in developing a remedial program for disadvantaged students and to some instructors interested in applying the audio-tutorial approach to instruction.

XII.

DESIGN FOR THE FUTURE

The third year of the Program With Developing Institutions (1970-71), already well underway as this is written, is a year of diversified programming. AAJC had recommended to regional coordinators and interested individual colleges that a dual program be applied for--a continuation of the Faculty Development Project for the 53 colleges funded for 1969-70 (if they reapplied and were found acceptable), and an entirely new group of colleges to start on a modified version of the first year's Planning For Development Project, as noted earlier.

This was the second year in which AAJC had invited applications for a two-track program, and this time the recommended program was funded, with 40 colleges approved for a continuation of the Faculty Development Project and 36 for a Planning and Development Project. In addition, three special groups were approved for AAJC assistance in varying degrees: a Puerto Rico Consortium of sixteen colleges (originally organized with AAJC assistance); a Mexican-American Border Consortium of six colleges; and eleven colleges which had "unilateral NTF" (National Teaching Fellows) programs, with no four-year cooperating institutions. Of the latter group, five were also in one or the other of the two major PWDI projects; so AAJC is involved with 104 different funded colleges for 1970-71. The roster follows:

1970-71 PROGRAM WITH DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT:

I. Norwalk CC, Norwalk, Conn. 06854*
Cape Cod CC, Hyannis, Mass. 02601
II. Mount Olive College, Mt. Olive, N.C. 28365*
Chowan College, Murfreesboro, N.C. 27855
North Greenville JC, Tigerville, S.C. 29688
III. Abraham Baldwin Agric. C., Tifton, Ga. 31794*
Andrew College, Cuthbert, Ga. 31740
DeKalb College, Clarkston, Ga. 30021
Emmanuel Coll., Franklin Springs, Ga. 30639
Gordon College, Barnesville, Ga. 30204
Truett McConnell Coll., Cleveland, Ga. 30528
IV. Cumberland College, Lebanon, Tenn. 37087*
Martin College, Pulaski, Tenn. 38478
Mississippi Delta JC, Moorhead, Miss. 38761
Mobile State JC, Mobile, Ala. 36603
Morristown College, Morristown, Tenn. 37814
Southern Baptist C., Walnut Ridge, Ark. 72476
S.W. Mississippi JC, Summit, Miss. 39666
Wood Junior College, Mathiston, Miss. 39752
V. Vincennes University, Vincennes, Ind. 47591*
Black Hawk College, Moline, Ill. 61265
Joliet Junior College, Joliet, Ill. 60436
Suomi College, Hancock, Mich. 49930
VI. Eastern Iowa CC, Muscatine, Iowa 52761*
Eastern Iowa CC, Clinton, Iowa 52732
Ellsworth College, Iowa Falls, Iowa 50126
Ottumwa Heights College, Ottumwa, Ia. 52501
VII. Dodge City CJC, Dodge City, Kans. 67801*
Coffeyville CJC, Coffeyville, Kans. 67337
Hutchinson CJC, Hutchinson, Kans. 67501
Independence CJC, Independence, Kans. 67301
Kansas City Kansas CJC, Kansas City 66101
Rangely College, Rangely, Colo. 81648
VIII. Lee College, Baytown, Tex. 77520*
Alvin College, Alvin, Tex. 77511
Kilgore Junior College, Kilgore, Tex. 75662
Okla. Military Acad., Claremore, Okla. 74017
Southwest Texas JC, Uvalde, Tex. 78801
Texarkana College, Texarkana, Tex. 75501
Wharton County JC, Wharton, Tex. 77488

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECT:

I. Hagerstown JC, Hagerstown, Md. 21740
Prince George's CC, Largo, Md. 20870
Quinsigamond CC, Worcester, Mass. 01605
II. Caldwell Tech. Inst., Lenoir, N.C. 28645
Coll. of the Albemarle, Eliz. City, N.C. 27909
Forsyth Tech. Inst., Winston Salem, N.C. 27103
Greenville Tech. Educ. Center, S.C. 29606
Kittrell College, Kittrell, N.C. 27544
Palmer College, Charleston, S.C. 29401
Surry CC, Dobson, N.C. 27017
III. Brewton Parker College, Mt. Vernon, Ga. 30445
Chipola Junior College, Marianna, Fla. 32446
Okaloosa Walton JC, Niceville, Fla. 32578
IV. Aquinas Junior College, Nashville, Tenn. 37205
T. A. Lawson St. JC, Birmingham, Ala. 35228
V. Ashland CC, Ashland, Ky. 41101
Bay de Noc CC, Escabana, Mich. 49829
Elizabethtown CC, Elizabethtown, Ky. 42701
Gogebic CC, Ironwood, Mich. 49938
Hopkinsville CC, Hopkinsville, Ky. 42240
Malcolm X College, Chicago, Ill. 60612
Prestonburg CC, Prestonburg, Ky. 41653
Somerset CC, Somerset, Ky. 42501
VI. Hibbing State JC, Hibbing, Minn. 55746
Iowa Lakes CC, Estherville, Iowa 51334
Marshalltown CC, Marshalltown, Iowa 50158
Presentation College, Aberdeen, S.Dak. 57401
St. Mary's College, O'Fallon, Mo. 63366
Willmar State JC, Willmar, Minn. 56201
VII. Fairbury JC, Fairbury, Nebr. 68352
Fort Scott CJC, Fort Scott, Kans. 66701
Hesston College, Hesston, Kans. 67062
Highland CJC, Highland, Kans. 66035
McCook College, McCook, Nebr. 69001
Nebr. Western Coll., Scottsbluff, Nebr. 69361
Pratt CJC, Pratt, Kans. 67124

OTHER GROUPS:

Mexican-American Border Group:
Texas Southmost Coll., Brownsville 78520*
Arizona Western Coll., Yuma, Ariz. 85634
Cochise College, Douglas, Ariz. 85607
Imperial Valley Coll., Imperial, Calif. 92251
Laredo Junior College, Laredo, Tex. 78040
Southwestern Coll., Chula Vista, Calif. 92010

Puerto Rican Group:
Puerto Rico JC -- 2 campuses*
Catholic U. of P.R. -- 6 regional centers
Inter American U. -- 5 regional colleges
Univ. of Puerto Rico -- 3 regional colleges

National Teaching Fellows Group:
*Central YMCA CC, Chicago, Ill. 60606
Casper College, Casper, Wyo. 82601
Crowder College, Neosho, Mo. 64850
Dawson College, Glendive, Mont. 59330
Dixie JC, St. George, Utah 84770
Vermillion State JC, Ely, Minn. 55731
Ellsworth College, Iowa Falls, Ia. 50126
Morristown Coll., Morristown, Tenn. 37814
St. Mary's Coll., O'Fallon, Mo. 63336
Southwest Texas JC, Uvalde, Tex. 78801
Texarkana Coll., Texarkana, Tex. 75501

*designates coordinating institution

Because of the increasing complexity of the program, there has been a division of labor and responsibilities in 1970-71, with the PWDI Director handling the Planning Project, the Border Consortium and publications, and the Associate Director, the Faculty Development Project, the Puerto Rico Consortium and the National Teaching Fellows Group.

During 1970-71, new emphasis will be placed on helping the disadvantaged student, through better human relations (for motivation), and more individualized instruction (the systems approach, audio-tutorial methods, etc.) in all PWDI projects. The Planning and Development Project will pay special attention to planning and administering programs of instruction that are oriented toward student and community needs.

Several kinds of workshops and inter-campus visits are planned for the current year, in addition to the consulting and publications programs. All funded and associate colleges will be invited to participate in workshops on such subjects as human relations, individualized learning, minority group education, occupational curriculum development, community relations, private colleges, Federal programs and administrative organization.

Looking Ahead

What of the future? Asked by officials of USOE to look ahead for three years, AAJC staff and the PWDI national advisors and regional coordinators discussed the future of the program at a meeting in April 1970. There was general agreement that:

(1) The AAJC/PWDI extensive program of aid to developing institutions should be continued under Title III.

(2) The Program With Developing Institutions should be considered a "seed money" venture, with new colleges coming in each year.

(3) A feasible model would be a three-year cycle--a year of planning and two years of faculty and instructional development, after which in most cases the colleges would be ready to organize their own groups.

(4) There should also be provision for specialized groupings with a flexible, diversified program under the PWDI umbrella if needed.

(5) The minimum requirement of five years of operation to qualify for aid under Title III should be scrapped, since many of the developing junior colleges which most need help are less than five years old.

(6) AAJC should continue to develop cooperative arrangements with other groups, to the mutual advantage of all.

If the Higher Education Act is renewed and the AAJC/PWDI Program is more adequately funded in the years to come, the AAJC-related extensive funding program could be greatly expanded as a supplement to the traditional program of intensive bilateral and consortium aid under Title III of HEA. Such a program could continue to give initial impetus to sound planning and the diffusion of innovations already proven to be effective on the junior college campus.

APPENDIX A

The 1969-70 Program Proposal

CONSOLIDATED PROPOSAL FOR COOPERATION

Introduction - A special problem exists among developing junior colleges. Many, particularly the smaller ones, are struggling for survival and improvement, but they lack the staff and resources to develop a program which will enable them to plan for their own improvement and for the attainment of excellence in instruction. They need expert guidance from consultants, through workshops and visits to more developed colleges, and from publications dealing with their special needs.

This problem led to a new approach to funding for a large number of developing junior colleges in 1968-69. The U. S. Office of Education arranged with 12 leading colleges to become regional coordinators for groups of colleges needing special help. These regional centers then contracted with the American Association of Junior Colleges for services which included staffing and planning conferences, specialized workshops, the selection of teams of consultants, and an extensive program of publications throughout the year. The coordinating colleges retained the portion of the funds granted for reimbursement of travel expenses incurred by representatives of colleges in each region, and contracted with AAJC for specialized services and central administration of the program.

The 1968-69 AAJC Program With Developing Institutions proved highly successful in helping the 85 participating colleges to study their own problems and make plans for their solution. The team consulting process, with specialists in administration, faculty and curriculum problems, and student personnel policy, proved very beneficial in over 90 percent of the colleges; a great majority of the 85 colleges accepted many of the suggestions made by the teams, and went on to evaluate their own problems and reorganize their efforts in more effective ways. Evidence of this is available in nearly all reports of consultants after their revisits to the campuses in the Fall of 1968.

The flexible nature of the program made it possible to expand it in fields where needs existed. Thus special workshops have been held for private colleges and are scheduled for student personnel officers and directors of vocational-technical and of community relations programs; returning consultants have been utilized

extensively for workshops with faculty and administration; and through frugal administration of the program, funds were made available for more specialized consultation to colleges which needed it, in addition to the teams of consultants in the original design.

The overriding objective of the 1968-69 program has been to assist the colleges in all possible ways to meet their needs in planning for improvement of college administration. Evaluation has been built into the program at several points. This approach enabled a large number of colleges to be benefitted at a relatively low cost per college. Evidence that this approach succeeded includes these points:

1. The following ratings were given to the consultant teams by the 85 college presidents or directors after the summer visits:

(a) Highest (very valuable)	57%
(b) Second highest (considerable value)	37%
TOTAL, top two on 5-point scale	94%

2. Ratings given to the August-September regional workshops by the individuals attending:

(a) Very valuable	53%
(b) Considerable value	34%
TOTAL, top two on 5-point scale	87%

3. Interest in the program was shown by many colleges not funded. So an "associate list" of additional junior colleges asking to participate was formed. These colleges received some publications of the program, and attended regional meetings at their own expense. The associate colleges numbered 133 by November 4, 1968 (in addition to the 85 colleges in the original program).

4. The regional coordinating colleges, originally assigned as funding agents, have shown a great deal of initiative, providing valuable new leadership for developing junior colleges. Special conferences, consultation programs, and inter-campus visits not in the original program resulted in several cases, with regional coordinators playing a leading part in the arrangements.

5. In many cases, this program has also led to further initiative being taken by member colleges in extending the consulting process at their own expense.

6. As a result of this program, several separate consortium arrangements have been completed (in Kentucky, Alabama, Oklahoma, South Texas, Washington, California, the Carolinas, and Northern Michigan) or are in process of development (Georgia and Puerto Rico).

7. The 1968-69 program was evaluated favorably by the National Advisory Committee on September 24, 1968, and recommendations for the second-year project given at that meeting were incorporated in the 1969-70 proposal.

Future of the Program - A questionnaire given to heads of institutions attending the regional conferences in August-September (returned by 77 member and 39 associate colleges) showed:

93% said the present program on Planning for Development or one like it should be repeated in a second year (91% of member colleges so stated).

97% said they favored a second program of faculty orientation and in-service training adapted to local needs (98% of member colleges, 97% of associates so stated).

98% said they "would like to participate in a project with AAJC as the coordinating agency if one is funded for 1969-70," and would apply for it under Title III this year. (All but two member colleges and all associates attending the regional workshops so stated).

Under the faculty development program, the preferred fields were (in order of importance):

	No. of Colleges Interested
Modern teaching and learning methods	54
Developmental (remedial) education	46
Orientation in junior/community college philosophy	39
Occupational education	30
Other	9

(Many colleges designated more than one top preference.)

From these results, it was clear that a two-track project was needed for 1969-70: (1) a Planning for Development Program modeled after this year's program, serving mainly colleges not included in the 1968-69 program; and (2) a Faculty Development Program for improving orientation and instruction, offering a variety of services from which the colleges could pick and choose the ones most needed. Most of the colleges in the 1968-69 program were expected to apply for this new program.

Proposed Organization of 1969-70 Project

The 1969-70 Project for Developing Junior Colleges would consist of ten regional consortia, unless more are needed in view of the number of colleges funded in some areas. The coordinating institutions were rotated where it was practical to do so, in order to spread responsibility and leadership opportunity, and also to avoid having regional coordinators located in states where consortia were being formed which might supercede the AAJC program.

The regions would be as follows (all colleges listed as coordinators have agreed to serve if designated):

I. Atlantic - The Atlantic Seaboard states, South Carolina and northward, including West Virginia. Coordinator: Harford Junior College, Bel Air, Maryland.

II. Georgia - a single state region. Coordinator: Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Tifton, Georgia.

III. Southeast -Alabama and Florida. Coordinator: North Florida Junior College, Madison, Florida.

IV. Middle South - Tennessee, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana. Coordinator: Cumberland College of Tennessee, Lebanon, Tennessee.

V. Midwest - Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Missouri. Coordinator: Vincennes University, Vincennes, Indiana.

VI. Northwest -Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas. Coordinator: Eastern Iowa Community College, Bettendorf, Iowa.

VII. Southwest -Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico. Coordinator: St. Gregory's College, Shawnee, Oklahoma.

VIII. Plains - Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado. Coordinator: Dodge City Community College, Dodge City, Kansas.

IX. West - Other states west to the Pacific, and including Alaska and Hawaii. Coordinator: Treasure Valley Community College, Ontario, Oregon.

X. Puerto Rico - (Special project for all 16 two-year colleges) Coordinator: University of Puerto Rico.

Interested colleges were invited by the regional coordinators to apply for membership in one or another of these ten regional consortia by indicating which track or tracks were of greatest interest and assigning a priority if both were requested. Features common to both programs would include the following:

1. A conference of the advisory committee and the regional coordinators would be held immediately after the project is funded, probably in Washington in early April.

2. The publications program would serve the colleges in both programs.

3. Colleges in one program only would [illegible] to limited parts of the other programs, through the regional meetings and the use of some of the same consultants. An effort would be made to keep the programs flexible, as in 1968-69.

The administration of the 1969-70 project by AAJC would follow lines similar to the current year's program, using comparable central

office staff, with the addition of four persons: a program specialist on faculty development and instructional techniques, an administrative assistant, one additional staff assistant and one more stenographer. The new "track," on faculty development, will require a highly specialized person with knowledge in depth on teaching and learning techniques, developmental education and other new aspects of junior college instruction. This person would be given responsibility for program planning for the various individual campuses involved in the faculty development program. The other additional personnel are mainly for support of this new program.

Advisory Committee - The following eight members have agreed to serve on the National Advisory Committee (six of them being holdovers from the 1968-69 Advisory Committee):

Dr. Isaac Beckes, President, Vincennes University, Vincennes, Indiana
Dr. Johnnie Ruth Clarke, Dean of Academic Affairs, St. Petersburg Junior College, St. Petersburg, Florida
Dr. Frederic T. Giles, Dean, College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington
Mrs. Mayrelee Newman, Director of Instructional Resources, El Centro College, Dallas County Junior College District, Dallas, Texas
Dr. Virginia R. Keehan, Coordinator of Planning and Development, Chicago City College, Chicago, Illinois
Dr. S. V. Martorana, Vice Chancellor for Junior Colleges, State University of New York, Albany, New York
Dr. W. Burkette Raper, President, Mount Olive Junior College, Mount Olive, North Carolina
Dr. James L. Wattenbarger, Director, Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida

Two faculty members will probably be added to this committee, one from the South and one from the North or Northeast.

The proposed AAJC Developing Junior Colleges Project for 1969-70 would build on the experience of the 1968-69 AAJC Program With Developing Institutions. The Planning for Development Program would encompass the main features of the earlier program while adding certain features, such as a small cost grant for institutional research and planning, inter-campus visits, and more provision for specialized consultation in addition to the generalized team approach.

In view of the widespread need for faculty orientation and development programs to improve teaching and learning techniques, both among general students and the disadvantaged, a second track has been added to the proposal for 1969-70. A Faculty Development program would be worked out on each individual campus in close cooperation with faculty as well as administration. It would

involve campus workshops as needed, consultation, conferences, inter-campus visits and other professional activities.

To encourage independent, innovative effort, each program would carry a small cash grant for each college participating to use in any way it saw fit in order to make its participation in the program more effective. More responsibility would also be given to the regional coordinating colleges, in view of the initiative and effective leadership they displayed in the current year's program.

The AAJC Project would also continue to encourage member colleges to take the initiative in forming cooperative arrangements (consortia) to make maximum use of funds from all sources. As noted above, several consortia are in the process of formation, and others may mature in the coming year, as a result of the 1968-69 program. If this project succeeds, such cooperating groups may largely replace the special project approach to planning for development and improvement of junior college instruction.

Coordinating colleges will contract with the American Association of Junior Colleges to provide general administrative services for the program, including (1) consultants, (2) publications, (3) regional and national conferences, and (4) general administrative coordination.

Description of Separate Programs

A. Planning for Development - This program would be similar to the one which evolved in 1968-69, with the following features built in:

1. A flat $1,000 grant directly to the college for planning purposes, to use as needed.

2. A two-day national conference on planning, to be held at Vincennes University (a two-year college), Vincennes, Indiana, in late June. Attendance: three per college - typically the president, a dean, and a board member.

3. A program of consultation with two-day visits to each participating college, usually by three consultants specializing respectively in (1) administration and finance, (2) faculty and instruction, and (3) student personnel services. A team report with preliminary observations would be filed with the college, with copies to AAJC.

4. Two-day regional meetings on planning would be held in late August or early September, with up to six representatives from each member college funded to attend.

5. Team revisits in the Fall would be for three days each, for the purpose of re-study and to allow time for the consultants to serve in faculty workshops.

6. Additional specialized consultants would be supplied to the college as needed. This service would include consultants for special workshops in faculty orientation and development, if desirable.

7. One-day drive-in conferences on a statewide or two-state basis, on topics of special interest, would be scheduled as needed during the Winter or early Spring.

8. Provision would be made for inter-campus visits of two days or more duration so that several staff members of each participating college could see successful programs in action.

9. One person from each college would be invited to attend the 1970 AAJC Convention on an expense-paid basis.

10. A year-long program of publications would serve the colleges in the program.

B. Faculty Development - This would be a separate program for the most part, but with provision for some degree of overlap with the planning program. The essential parts of the program:

1. A flat $1,500 grant to each college for use as needed in planning faculty development work outside the scope of the program.

2. Individual consultant visits to each of the participating colleges in late April, May, and early June, to discuss the faculty development program with college administration and faculty leaders. Preliminary preferences would be expressed, and the college would be asked to appoint a faculty chairman and working committee to study plans for faculty workshops in the Fall. If possible, at the time of the first visit a workshop on objectives for the program would be held by the consultant.

3. A national conference of consultants to be involved in the faculty program would be held just after the planning conference, at Vincennes University. At this time proposed strategies for the faculty program would be considered and plans made for the work in the coming school year. University experts and state officials would be invited.

4. Regional meetings would be held in late summer for colleges in this program, probably in conjunction with the planning workshops but extending an extra day. At the regional meetings an effort would be made to get expense-paid attendance by several faculty members from each college, plus representatives of University schools of

education and state junior college officials. Objectives would include sharing experiences, discussing strategy and implementation of the program, and exploring resources available in the region.

5. In the Fall and Winter, series of workshops for individual colleges (and possibly some for groups of colleges) would be arranged, using the consultants singly or in teams of two in the following areas:

(a) Faculty orientation (one-day workshop sessions) where needed, plus one or more of the following:

(b) Teaching and learning techniques, including audio-visual, individualized instruction, learning resource centers, and classroom techniques.

(c) Developmental (remedial) education.

(d) Occupational education.

The workshops would include any combination of these special areas which the college feels is desirable from the point of view of local need. The first two would be the commonest combination, in all probability.

Timing of the workshops could be on weekends (two or more Friday-Saturday sessions or a series of Saturday meetings); or an intensive period of several days during the week when possible. Preferences would be for wider time spread in most cases.

6. Additional consultant workshop sessions would be scheduled later in the year, probably in Winter and early Spring, for follow-up and evaluation purposes. These would be regional meetings, or could be broken down into statewide or two-state drive-in meetings, whichever would be most useful.

7. Some flexibility would be allowed for assignment of specialized consultants to meet particular needs of participating colleges, apart from the faculty development workshops.

8. One faculty member from each college in the program would be invited to attend the AAJC Annual Convention in February 1970 on an expense-paid basis, to participate in the general program and in special meetings on faculty development. College administrators would be encouraged to send a second faculty member at college expense whenever possible.

9. A year-long series of publications would support the program, some in common with the planning program, some separately.

Evaluation and Expected Outcome

Evaluation would be built into every major phase of the two programs. At the end of the year, the institutions would be queried in detail about the effect of the total program on the college.

The expected outcome of the planning program in 1969-70 will be the adoption of some suggested changes in the following areas: (1) administrative organization and funding, (2) improvement of curriculum and instruction, and (3) improvement and extension of student personnel services. In addition, specialized consultation would bring about changes in such areas as remedial instruction, occupational programming and learning resource centers.

In the faculty development program, the expected results would include the following:

(1) An upgrading of faculty orientation programs, producing a greater awareness on the part of faculty of the mission and philosophy of the comprehensive junior college;

(2) Upgrading of faculty skills in using modern teaching devices, including audio-visual aids, individualized instruction, and programmed learning; and

(3) Enrichment of those portions of the junior college curriculum designed to serve especially the educationally handicapped and the technical and adult students.

This program would also emphasize the need for inter-institutional cooperation, and would be expected to result in the formation of additional consortia.

A P P E N D I X B

A Listing of Funded and Associate Colleges,

1969-70 Program With Developing Institutions

Funded Colleges

REGION ONE - NORTHEAST

*Harford Junior College, Bel Air, Maryland 21014
Cape Cod Community College, Hyannis, Massachusetts 02601 **
Catonsville Community College, Baltimore, Maryland 21228
Norwalk Community College, Norwalk, Connecticut 06854 **

REGION TWO - THE CAROLINAS

*Mount Olive Junior College, Mount Olive, North Carolina 28365
Chowan College, Murfreesboro, North Carolina 27855 **
Lenoir County Community College, Kinston, North Carolina 28501
Mitchell College, Statesville, North Carolina 28677
North Greenville Junior College, Tigerville, South Carolina 29688
Peace College, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

REGION THREE - SOUTHEAST

*Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Tifton, Georgia 31794
Andrew College, Cuthbert, Georgia 31740 **
DeKalb College, Clarkston, Georgia 30021 **
Emmanuel College, Franklin Springs, Georgia 30639 **
Gordon Military College, Barnesville, Georgia 30204 **
Reinhardt College, Waleska, Georgia 30183
Truett McConnell College, Cleveland, Georgia 30528 **
Southern Baptist College, Walnut Ridge, Arkansas 72476

REGION FOUR - MIDDLE SOUTH

*Cumberland College, Lebanon, Tennessee 37087
Copiah-Lincoln Junior College, Wesson, Mississippi 39191
Martin College, Pulaski, Tennessee 38478
Mississippi Delta Junior College, Moorhead, Mississippi 38761
Mobile State Junior College, Mobile, Alabama 36603
Morristown College, Morristown, Tennessee 37814
Northwest Alabama State Junior College, Phil Campbell, Alabama 35581
Southwest Mississippi Junior College, Summit, Mississippi 39666
Wood Junior College, Mathiston, Mississippi 39752 **

REGION FIVE - MIDWEST

*Vincennes University, Vincennes, Indiana 47591
Belleville Junior College, Belleville, Illinois 62221
Black Hawk College, Moline, Illinois 61265
Joliet Junior College, Joliet, Illinois 60432
Lansing Community College, Lansing, Michigan 48914
Michigan Christian College, Rochester, Michigan 48063
Suomi College, Hancock, Michigan 49930

REGION SIX - NORTHWEST

*Eastern Iowa Community College, Muscatine, Iowa 52761
Eastern Iowa Community College, Clinton, Iowa 52732
Ellsworth Community College, Iowa Falls, Iowa 50126
Mesabi State Junior College, Virginia, Minnesota 55792
Ottumwa Heights College, Ottumwa, Iowa 52501

REGION SEVEN - PLAINS

*Dodge City Community Junior College, Dodge City, Kansas 67801
Coffeyville Community Junior College, Coffeyville, Kansas 67337
Hutchinson Community Junior College, Hutchinson, Kansas 67501**
Independence Community Junior College, Independence, Kansas 67301
Kansas City Kansas Community Junior College, Kansas City, Kansas 66101
Otero Junior College, La Junta, Colorado 81050
Rangely College, Rangely, Colorado 81648

REGION EIGHT - SOUTHWEST

*Lee College, Baytown, Texas 77520
Kilgore College, Kilgore, Texas 75620 **
Oklahoma Military Academy, Claremore, Oklahoma 74017 **
Southwest Texas Junior College, Uvalde, Texas 78801
Texarkana College, Texarkana, Texas 75501
Texas Southmost College, Brownsville, Texas 78520 **
Wharton County Junior College, Wharton, Texas 77488

---

* designates regional coordinating institutions
** designates colleges new to 1969-70 program and not in first-year program

Associate Colleges

REGION ONE - NORTHEAST

Connecticut
Hartford College for Women, Hartford 06105
Housatonic Community College, Stratford 06497
Manchester Community College, Manchester 06040
Norwalk State Technical College, Norwalk 06854

Delaware
Wesley College, Dover 19901

District of Columbia
Immaculata College of Washington 20016
Mount Vernon Junior College 20007
Washington Technical Institute 20008

Maine
Westbrook Junior College, Portland 04103

Maryland
Allegany Community College, Cumberland 21502
Anne Arundel Community College, Arnold 21012
Charles County Community College, La Plata 20646
Essex Community College, Baltimore County 21237
Hagerstown Junior College, Hagerstown 21740
Howard County Community College, Columbia 21043
Kirkland Hall College, Easton 21601
Prince George's Community College, Largo 20970

Massachusetts
Bay Path Junior College, Longmeadow 01106
Becker Junior College, Worcester 01609
Dean Junior College, Franklin 02038
Greenfield Community College, Greenfield 01301
Leicester Junior College, Leicester 01524
Massasoit Community College, West Bridgewater 02379
Worcester Junior College, Worcester 01608

New Jersey
Bergen Community College, Paramus 07652
Burlington County College, Pemberton 08068
Essex County College, Newark 07012
Gloucester County College, Sewell 08080
Mercer County Community College, Trenton 08608
Ocean County College, Toms River 08753
Tombrock College, West Paterson 07424
Union College, Cranford 07016

New York
Alfred Agricultural and Technical College, Alfred 14802
Borough of Manhattan Community College, New York City 10020
Cazenovia College, Cazenovia 13035
Corning Community College, Corning 14830
Dutchess Community College, Poughkeepsie 12601
Harriman College, Harriman 10926
Hilbert College, Hamburg 14075
Onondaga Community College, Syracuse 13210
Tompkins Cortland Community College, Groton 13073
Villa Maria College of Buffalo, Buffalo 14335

Pennsylvania
Bucks County Community College, Newton 18940
Community College of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh 15219
Community College of Beaver County, Freedom 15042
Community College of Delaware County, Media 19063
Community College of Philadelphia, Philadelphia 19134
Harcum Junior College, Bryn Mawr 19010
Keystone Junior College, La Plume 18440
Mount Aloysius Junior College, Cresson 16630
Northampton County Area Community College, Bethlehem 18107
Sacred Heart Junior College, Yardley 19067

Vermont
Vermont College, Montpelier 05602
Vermont Technical College, Randolph Center 05061

Virginia
Ferrum Junior College, Ferrum 24088
Luther Rice College, Alexandria 22310
Northern Virginia Community College, Annandale 22003
Virginia Highlands Community College, Abingdon 24210

West Virginia
Ohio Valley College, Parkersburg 26101
Parkersburg Center, U. of West Virginia, Parkersburg 26101
Potomac State College, Keyser 26726

REGION TWO - THE CAROLINAS

North Carolina
Caldwell Technical Institute, Lenoir 28645
College of the Albemarle, Elizabeth City 27909
Davidson County Community College, Lexington 27292
Forsyth Technical Institute, Winston-Salem 27103
Gaston College, Dallas 28034
Kittrell College, Kittrell 27544
Lees McRae College, Banner Elk 28604
Louisburg College, Louisburg 27549
Montreat Anderson College, Montreat 28757

Surry Community College, Dobson 27017
Wayne Community College, Goldsboro 27530
Wingate College, Wingate 28174

South Carolina
Anderson College, Anderson 29621
Greenville Technical Education Center, Greenville 29606
Richland Technical Education Center, Columbia 29205
Spartanburg Junior College, Spartanburg 29301

REGION THREE - SOUTHEAST

Georgia
Albany Junior College, Albany 31705
Birdwood Junior College, Thomasville 31792
Brewton Parker College, Mt. Vernon 30445
Brunswick Junior College, Brunswick 31520
Clayton Junior College, Forest Park 30050
Dalton Junior College, Dalton 30720
Gainesville Junior College, Gainesville 30501
Georgia Military College, Milledgeville 31061
Kennesaw Junior College, Marietta 30060
Middle Georgia College, Cochran 31014
Norman College, Norman Park 31771
Oxford College of Emory University, Oxford 32067
South Georgia College, Douglas 31533
Young Harris College, Young Harris 30582

Florida
Brevard Junior College, Cocoa 32922
Broward Junior College, Fort Lauderdale 33314
Broward County Vocational Center, Fort Lauderdale 33308
Central Florida Junior College, Ocala 32670
Edison Junior College, Fort Myers 33901
Florida College, Temple Terrace 33617
Florida Keys Junior College, Key West 33040
Gulf Coast Junior College, Panama City 32401
Indian River Junior College, Fort Pierce 33450
Lake City Junior College, Lake City 32055
Lake Sumter Junior College, Leesburg 32748
Manatee Junior College, Bradenton 33505
Miami Dade Junior College, Miami 33156
North Florida Junior College, Madison 32340
Okaloosa Walton Junior College, Niceville 32578
Orlando Junior College, Orlando 32803
Palm Beach Junior College, Lake Worth 33460
Polk Junior College, Winter Haven 33880
St. Johns River Junior College, Palatka 32077
St. Petersburg Junior College, St. Petersburg 33733
Santa Fe Junior College, Gainesville 32601

South Florida Junior College, Avon Park 33825
Tallahassee Junior College, Tallahassee 32304
Webber College, Babson Park 33827

REGION FOUR - MIDDLE SOUTH

Alabama
Alabama Christian College, Montgomery 36109
Alexander City State Junior College, Alexander City 35010
Cullman College, Cullman 35055
Gadsden State Junior College, Gadsden 35903
Jefferson State Junior College, Birmingham 35215
Lurleen B. Wallace State Junior College, Andalusia 36420
Northeast Alabama State Junior College, Rainsville 35986
Snead State Junior College, Boaz 35957
Southern Union State Junior College, Wadley 36276
Theodore A. Lawson Junior College, Birmingham 35211

Arkansas
Westark Junior College, Fort Smith 72901

Louisiana
Delgado College, New Orleans 70119

Mississippi
East Mississippi Junior College, Scooba 39358
Holmes Junior College, Goodman 39079
Mary Holmes College, West Point 39773
Northeast Mississippi Junior College, Booneville 38829
Pearl River Junior College, Poplarville 39470

Tennessee
Aquinas Junior College, Nashville 37205
Freed Hardeman College, Henderson 38340
Hiwassee College, Madisonville 37354

REGION FIVE - MIDWEST

Illinois
Bogan Campus, Chicago City College, Chicago 60652
Carl Sandburg College, Galesburg 61401
Central YMCA Community College, Chicago 60606
College of DuPage, Glen Ellyn 60137
Illinois Valley Community College, Ogelsby 61348
Kankakee Community College, Kankakee 60901
Kennedy-King Campus, Chicago City College, Chicago 60621
Kendall College, Evanston 60204
Lake Land College, Mattoon 61938
Lincoln Trail College, Robinson 62454

Monticello College, Godfrey 62035
Moraine Valley Community College, Palos Hills 60465
Morton College, Cicero 60650
Oakton Community College, Morton Grove 60053
Olney Central College, Olney 62450
Prairie State College, Chicago Heights 60411
Robert Morris College, Carthage 62321
Rock Valley College, Rockford 61101
Southeastern Illinois College, Harrisburg 62946
Thornton Community College, Harvey 60426
Wabash Valley College, Mt. Carmel 62863

Indiana
Indiana Vocational Technical College, Indianapolis 46204

Kentucky
Alice Lloyd College, Pippa Passes 41844
Henderson Community College, Henderson 42420
Lees Junior College, Jackson 41339
Lexington Technical Institute, Lexington 40506
Madisonville Community College, Madisonville 42431
Midway Junior College, Midway 40347
Northern Community College, Covington 41011
Paducah Community College, Paducah 42001
Saint Catherine College, Saint Catherine 40061
Southeast Community College, Cumberland 40823
Southeastern Christian College, Winchester 40391
Sue Bennett College, London 40741

Michigan
Davenport College of Business, Grand Rapids 49502
Flint Community Junior College, Flint 48503
Jackson Community College, Jackson 42901
Kalamazoo Valley Community College, Kalamazoo 49001
Kirtland Community College, Roscommon 48653
Lake Michigan College, Benton Harbor 49022
Macomb County Community College, Warren 48093
Montcalm Community College, Sidney 48885
St. Clair County Community College, Port Huron 48060
Schoolcraft College, Livonia 48151
Southwestern Michigan College, Dowagiac 49047
West Shore Community College, Scottville 49454

Ohio
Columbus Technical Institute, Columbus 43215
Ohio College of Applied Science, Cincinnati 45210
Sinclair Community College, Dayton 45402
University of Toledo Community and Tech. College, Toledo 43606

Wisconsin
Nicolet College and Technical Institute, Rhinelander 54501

REGION SIX - NORTHWEST

Iowa
Centerville Community College, Centerville 52544
Des Moines Area Community College, Ankeny 50021
Eastern Iowa Community College, Scott Campus, Davenport 52801
Iowa Lakes Community College, Estherville 51334
Kirkwood Community College, Cedar Rapids 52406
Marshalltown Community College, Marshalltown 50158
Palmer Junior College, Davenport 52803
Waldorf College, Forest City 50436

Minnesota
Hibbing State Junior College, Hibbing 55746
Metropolitan State Junior College, Minneapolis 55400

Missouri
Christian College, Columbia 65201
Crowder College, Neosho 64850
East Central Junior College, Union 63084
Jefferson College, Hillsboro 63050
Longview Community College, Lee's Summit 64063
Maple Woods Community College, Kansas City 64119
Mercy Junior College, St. Louis 63131
Mineral Area College, Flat River 63601
Penn Valley Community College, Kansas City 64111
St. Mary's of O'Fallon, O'Fallon 63366
State Fair Community College, Sedalia 63501
Three Rivers Junior College, Poplar Bluff 63901
Trenton Junior College, Trenton 64683

North Dakota
Assumption College, Richardton 58652
Bismarck Junior College, Bismarck 58501
Lake Region Junior College, Devils Lake 58301
North Dakota State School of Science, Wahpeton 58075

South Dakota
Freeman Junior College, Freeman 57029
Presentation College, Aberdeen 57401

REGION SEVEN - PLAINS

Colorado
Aims Community College, Greeley 80631
Colorado Mountain College, Glenwood Springs 81601
El Paso Community College, Colorado Springs 80903
Morgan County Community College, Brush 80723

Kansas
Allen County Community Junior College, Iola 66749
Barton County Community Junior College, Great Bend 67530
Butler County Community Junior College, El Dorado 67042
Central College, McPherson 67460
Colby Community Junior College, Colby 67701
Cowley County Community JC Vocational & Tech. School, Arkansas City
Donnelly College, Kansas City 66102
Fort Scott Community Junior College, Fort Scott 66701
Garden City Community Junior College, Garden City 67846
Hesston College, Hesston 67602
Highland Community Junior College, Highland 66035
Johnson County Community Junior College, Shawnee Mission 66203
Neosho County Community Junior College, Chanute 66720
Pratt Community Junior College, Pratt 67124

Nebraska
Central Nebraska Technical College, Hastings 68901
Nebraska Western College, Scottsbluff 69361
Northeastern Nebraska College, Norfolk 68701
Platte Junior College, Columbus 68601
York College, York 68467

REGION EIGHT - SOUTHWEST

Oklahoma
Bacone College, Bacone 74420
Bartlesville Wesleyan College, Bartlesville 74003
Connors State College, Warner 74469
Eastern Oklahoma State College, Wilburton 74578
Northern Oklahoma College, Tonkawa 74653
Poteau Community College, Poteau 74953
Saint Greogry's College, Shawnee 74801
Southwestern College, Oklahoma City 73127

Texas
Amarillo College, Amarillo 79105
Bee County College, Beeville 78102
Cisco Junior College, Cisco 76437
Galveston College, Galveston 77550
Hill Junior College, Hillsboro 76645
Laredo Junior College, Laredo 78040
Paris Junior College, Paris 75460
Ranger Junior College, Ranger 76470
San Antonio College District, San Antonio 78212
Weatherford College, Weatherford 76086

FAR WEST

Alaska
Anchorage Community College, Anchorage 99504
Juneau Douglas Community College, Juneau 99801
Ketchikan Community College, Ketchikan 99901

Arizona
Arizona Western College, Yuma 85634
Cochise College, Douglas 85607
Navajo Community College, Many Farms 86503
Pima County Junior College, Tucson 85701

California
American River College, Sacramento 95841
Canada College, Redwood City 94061
College of San Mateo, San Mateo 94402
Compton College, Compton 90221
Feather River College, Quincy 95971
Humphreys College, Stockton 95207
Lassen College, Susanville 96130
Modesto Junior College, Modesto 95350
Monterey Peninsula College, Monterey 93940
Ohlone College, Fremont 94537
Palo Verde College, Blythe 92225
San Bernardino Valley College, San Bernardino 92403
San Joaquin Delta College, Stockton 95204
Shasta College, Redding 96001
Yuba College, Marysville 95901

Hawaii
Honolulu Community College, Honolulu 96817
Kapiolani Community College, Honolulu 96814
Kauai Community College, Lihue 96766
Maui Community College, Kahului Maui 96732

Oregon
Blue Mountain Community College, Pendleton 97801
Central Oregon Community College, Bend 97701
Lane Community College, Eugene 97405
Southwestern Oregon Community College, Coos Bay 97420
Treasure Valley Community College, Ontario 97914

Utah
Snow College, Ephraim 84627

Washington
Bellevue Community College, Bellevue 98004
Big Bend Community College, Moses Lake 98837
Columbia Basin College, Pasco 99301
Community College District Five, Everett 98201
Fort Steilacoom Community College, Tacoma 98499

Peninsula College, Port Angeles 98362
Spokane Community College, Spokane 99204
Walla Walla Community College, Walla Walla 99362
Wenatchee Valley College, Wenatchee 98801
Yakima Valley College, Yakima 98902

Wyoming
Laramie County Community College, Cheyenne 82001

PUERTO RICO

University of Puerto Rico:
  Arecibo Regional College, Arecibo 00612
  Cayey Regional College, Cayey 00633
  Humacao Regional College, Humacao 00661
Puerto Rico Junior College:
  Caguas Campus Extension, Caguas
  Rio Piedras Campus, Rio Piedras 00928
Catholic University of Puerto Rico:
  Aguadilla Regional Center, Aguadilla 00603
  Arecibo Regional Center, Arecibo 00613
  Bayamon Regional Center, Bayamon 00619
  Caguas Regional Center, Caguas
  Guayama Regional Center, Guayama
  Mayaguez Regional Center, Mayaguez 00708
Inter-American University:
  Aguadilla Regional College, Aguadilla 00603
  Arecibo Regional College, Arecibo 00612
  Barranquitas Regional College, Barranquitas 00618
  Bayamon Regional College, Bayamon 00619
  Ponce Regional College, Ponce 00731

CANADIAN AND FOREIGN

Canada
Columbia Junior College, Vancouver, British Columbia
Lethbridge Junior College, Lethbridge, Alberta
Malaspina College, Nanaimo, British Columbia
Mohawk College of Applied Arts and Technology, Hamilton, Ontario
Mount Royal College, Calgary, Alberta

Lebanon
Beirut College for Women, Beirut, Lebanon

A P P E N D I X C

LISTING OF CHIEF CONSULTANTS TO MEMBER COLLEGES

1969-1970 PROGRAM WITH DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

Northeast - Region One

Harford Junior College, Bel Air, Md.: Michael Brick, Director, Kellogg JC Leadership Program, Columbia University, N. Y.
Cape Cod Community College, Hyannis, Mass.: Roger Garrison, Chairman, Language & Literature Dept., Westbrook JC, Portland, Me.
Catonsville Community College, Baltimore, Md.: Robert Wiegman, Dean, College of Education, Florida Atlantic U., Boca Raton, Fla.
Norwalk Community College, Norwalk, Conn.: Mowat Fraser, 124 Garfield Road, West Hartford, Conn.

Carolinas - Region Two

Mount Olive Junior College, Mount Olive, N. C.: none
Chowan College, Murfreesboro, N. C.: Mayrelee Newman, Appalachian State University, Boone, N. C.
Lenoir County Community College, Kinston, N. C.: Robert Wiegman, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Fla.
Mitchell College, Statesville, N. C.: Allen Hurlburt, Professor of Education, Duke University, Durham, N. C.
North Greenville Junior College, Tigerville, S. C.: James Kiser, Central Piedmont CC, Charlotte, N. C.
Peace College, Raleigh, N. C.: Eileen Kuhns, Mt. Vernon Junior College, Washington, D. C.

Southeast - Region Three

Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Tifton, Ga.: E. B. Moore, Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.
Andrew College, Cuthbert, Ga.: Maurice Litton, Florida State U., Tallahassee, Fla.
DeKalb College, Clarkston, Ga.: Thomas Diener, Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
Emmanuel College, Franklin Springs, Ga.: E. B. Moore, Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.
Gordon Military College, Barnesville, Ga.: John Sullivan, Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
Reinhardt College, Waleska, Ga.: Marshall Hamilton, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.

Truett McConnell College, Cleveland, Ga.: Bruce Whitaker, Chowan College, Murfreesboro, N. C.
Southern Baptist College, Walnut Ridge, Ark.: Charles Monroe, 6546 South Keeler Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Middle South - Region Four

Cumberland College, Lebanon, Tenn.: Mack W. Craig, David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tenn.
Copiah-Lincoln JC, Wesson, Miss.: Galen Drewry, Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
Martin College, Pulaski, Tenn.: Eileen Kuhns, Mt. Vernon Junior College, Washington, D. C.
Mississippi Delta Junior College, Moorhead, Miss.: Ray Perkins, College of Education, U. of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.
Mobile State Junior College, Mobile, Ala.: Charles Atwell, Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.
Morristown College, Morristown, Tenn.: Johnnie Ruth Clarke, St. Petersburg JC, St. Petersburg, Fla.
Northwest Alabama State Junior College, Phil Campbell, Ala.: Joe Sutton, Univ. of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Ala.
Southwest Mississippi Junior College, Summit, Miss.: Galen Drewry, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
Wood Junior College, Mathiston, Miss.: John R. Fawcett, School of Education, University of Mississippi, University, Miss.

Midwest - Region Five

Vincennes University, Vincennes, Ind.: Samuel Postlethwait, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
Belleville Junior College, Belleville, Ill.: Harry Davis, Bi-State Regional Medical Program, St. Louis, Mo.
Black Hawk College, Moline, Ill.: John Grede, Chicago City College, Chicago, Ill.
Joliet Junior College, Joliet, Ill.: Virginia Keehan, Chicago City College, Chicago, Ill.
Lansing Community College, Lansing, Mich.: Marie Prahl, College of Education, Michigan State U., East Lansing, Mich.
Michigan Christian Junior College, Rochester, Mich.: Vaughn Whited, Oakland CC, Bloomfield Hills, Mich.
Suomi College, Hancock, Mich.: John Carlson, Montcalm CC, Sidney, Mich.

Northwest - Region Six

Eastern Iowa Community College, Muscatine, Iowa: Charles Monroe, 6546 South Keeler Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Eastern Iowa Community College, Clinton, Iowa: Isaac Beckes, Vincennes University, Vincennes, Ind.
Ellsworth College, Iowa Falls, Iowa: James Broman, Illinois Association of Community and Jr. Colleges, Chicago, Ill.

Mesabi State Junior College, Virginia, Minnesota: Gordon Mork, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Ottumwa Heights College, Ottumwa, Iowa: W. Merle Hill, Christian College, Columbia, Mo.

Plains - Region Seven

Dodge City Community Junior College, Dodge City, Kans.: John Turano, Adams State College, Alamosa, Colo.
Coffeyville Community Junior College, Coffeyville, Kans.: Walter Hunter, Meramec CC, St. Louis, Mo.
Hutchinson Community Junior College, Hutchinson, Kans.: James Reynolds, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.
Independence Community Junior College, Independence, Kans.: Joe Rushing, Tarrant County JC Dist., Fort Worth, Texas
Kansas City Kansas Community Junior College, Kansas City, Kans.: Robert Lahti, Wm. Rainey Harper College, Palatine, Ill.
Otero Junior College, La Junta, Colorado: Thomas Shay, Community College Leadership Program, U. of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.
Rangely Junior College, Rangely, Colorado: Herbert Phillips, Lake City Junior College, Lake City, Fla.

Southwest - Region Eight

Lee College, Baytown, Texas: James Wattenbarger, Institute of Higher Education, Univ. of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.
Kilgore College, Kilgore, Texas: James Reynolds, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.
Oklahoma Military Academy, Claremore, Okla.: Robert Alciatore, Oklahoma State Univ., Stillwater, Okla.
Southwest Texas Junior College, Uvalde, Texas: J. J. Hayden, Gulf Coast Junior College District, Perkinston, Miss.
Texarkana College, Texarkana, Texas: Robert Novak, Orange County Community College, Middletown, N.Y.
Texas Southmost College, Brownsville, Texas: Joe Rushing, Tarrant County Junior College District, Fort Worth, Tex.
Wharton County Junior College, Wharton, Texas: C. C. Colvert, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.

A P P E N D I X D

FINAL EVALUATION OF 1969-70 PROGRAM

BY THE 53 MEMBER COLLEGES

	(ratings in percentages) (1) Very valuable	(2) Consid. value	(3) Some value	(4) Little value	(5) No value
1. In general, how valuable to your college is the 1969-70 Faculty Development Project of the AAJC Program With Developing Inst.?	68	30	2	0	0
Please now evaluate the following component parts of this year's program:					
2. The National Conference at Vincennes U. on "Strategy for Change" (June 1969)	31	49	18	2	0
3. The seminars on Systems and Advanced Learning Technologies	22	41	35	2	0
4. The regional workshops and conferences (in general)	31	61	8	0	0
5. The newsletter ("Developing Junior Colleges")	53	34	11	2	0
6. Inter-campus visits	72	21	7	0	0
7. Meetings attended by instructors who would not otherwise have been able to go	79	19	2	0	0
8. Consultants' visits to the campus	51	41	6	2	0

Do you think this year's AAJC/PWDI program (Faculty Development, 1969-70) would have been equally valuable to your college if AAJC had not participated in it?

Yes 2% No 89% Don't know 9%

86/87-

A P P E N D I X E

EXPENDITURE OF PWDI FUNDS IN THE 1969-70 PROGRAM

Income:	
From Participating Colleges	$105,975.
Balance from 1968-69 Program (carried over)	10,123.
	$116,098.

Expenses:	Expenditures as of 6/30/70	Budgeted
Salaries, Taxes and Benefits	$59,061	$67,990
Travel	7,205	8,000
Office Supplies & Expenses	9,220	16,223
National Advisory Committee	4,011	5,224
Publications	9,717	6,199
Administrative Services	12,462	12,462
TOTAL EXPENSES	$101,676	$116,098

BALANCE (obligated and carried over to 1970-71) $14,422

Note:

Additional funds totaling $27,565 were allocated by regional coordinators to finance activities not covered by the above budget for (1) the Vincennes Conference, (2) the "SALT" Seminars on New Educational Technology, (3) complete coverage of all faculty and staff with the newsletter during the 1969-70 school year, and (4) special publications for Region III colleges. These special funds were spent or obligated for the purposes intended during the year.

Some activities were self-supporting out of the individual colleges' Title III funds. Thus registration charges of $25 per person for the Computer Workshop in Tifton, Georgia, and $35 for the Human Relations Workshop in Spartanburg, South Carolina, covered the conference costs for consultants and arrangements.